

I/III/III

1997 NCAA
CONVENTION
PROCEEDINGS

91st Annual Convention

January 11-15, 1997

Nashville, Tennessee

PROCEEDINGS

1997 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

91st Annual Convention

January 11-15, 1997

Nashville, Tennessee

I. Register 1997	9
Administrative Organization	9
Exhibitors, Donations, Visitors, Working Media	6
II. Proceedings of the 91st NCAA Convention	7
Opening Session Session	7
Opening Remarks	60
Convention Commencement	61
Report of the Council	32
Report of the National Association of Collegiate Athletic Administrators	34
The Association Address	71
Association Session	71
Association Session	71
Association Session	71
Association Session	72
Association Session	73
Association Session	74
Association Session	77
Association Session	77
Association Session	78
Association Session	78
Association Session	79
Association Session	80
Association Session	84
Association Session	84
Association Session	84
Association Session	85
Association Session	85
Association Session	87
Association Session	87
Association Session	87
Association Session	88
Association Session	88
Association Session	88
Association Session	89
Association Session	90
Association Session	91
Association Session	91
Association Session	92
Association Session	92



[ISSN 0162-1467]

THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422
913/339-1906
<http://www.ncaa.org>
June 1997

Edited By: Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing.*

Type/Layout: Marcia L. Stubbeman, *Graphics Specialist.*

Distributed to chief executive officers, conference commissioners, affiliated and corresponding members.

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

■ Table of Contents

I. Register 1997	9
Administrative Organization	9
Convention Delegates, Visitors, Working Media	26
II. Proceedings of the 91st NCAA Convention	
Opening Business Session	57
Opening Remarks	57
Convention Committees	60
Report of the Council	61
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee	62
State of the Association Address	64
Division I-A Business Session	71
Opening Remarks	71
Proposed Amendments	71
Financial Aid — Summer School — Division I (No. 65)	71
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II	
Football (No. 99)	72
Official Visits — Division I Football (No. 110)	73
Playing and Practice Seasons — Spring Practice —	
Divisions I and II Football (No. 125)	74
Division I-AA Business Session	77
Opening Remarks	77
Proposed Amendments	78
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II Football (No. 99)	78
Official Visits — Division I Football (No. 110)	78
Playing and Practice Seasons — Spring Practice —	
Divisions I and II Football (No. 125)	79
Discussion	80
Division I-AAA Business Session	84
Opening Remarks	84
Review of Proposed Amendments	84
Division II Business Session	85
Opening Remarks	85
Proposed Amendments	87
NCAA Membership Restructuring —	
Division II Presidents Council (No. 22)	87
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division II	
Administrative Committee (No. 23)	87
NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division II Budget and	
and Finance Committee (No. 24)	88
NCAA Membership Restructuring —	
Division II Management Council (No. 25)	88
NCAA Membership Restructuring —	
NCAA Committee Structure (No. 28)	89
NCAA Membership Restructuring —	
Division II Legislative Process (No. 51)	90
Division II Membership Requirements —	
Philosophy Statement (No. 52)	91
Membership Reclassification — Notification and	
Championships Eligibility (No. 53)	91
Membership Requirements — Provisional Membership (No. 55)	92
Division II Membership Requirements —	
Provisional Membership (No. 56)	92
Resolution: Participation in Intercollegiate	

Athletics — Division II Eligibility (No. 150).....	92
Weekly Hour Limitations — Skill Instruction — Division II Sports Other Than Football (No. 74).....	93
Discussion	95
Continuation of Division II Business Session.....	107
Proposed Amendments	109
Pass-Fail Grades (No. 90).....	109
Initial Eligibility — Core-Curriculum Requirements — Students With Disabilities (No. 91).....	109
Initial Eligibility — Early Admissions Program Waiver (No. 93)	110
Eligibility — Practice Opportunities for Olympics (No. 95).....	110
Eligibility — Hardship Waiver (No. 142).....	111
Exceptions to Outside Competition — Summer Basketball — Division II (No. 97)	111
De Minimus Violations — Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 98).....	113
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II Football (No. 99).....	113
Printed Recruiting Materials — Student-Athlete Handbook — Divisions I and II (No. 107).....	114
Discussion	114
Continuation of Division II Business Session.....	126
Opening Remarks.....	126
Proposed Amendments	127
Visit Unrelated to Recruitment — National Student-Athlete Day (No. 113).....	127
Tryout Exception — Golf and Tennis (No. 115)	127
Reconsideration of Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II Football (No. 99)	127
Camps and Clinics — Employment of Prospects — Division II (No. 116).....	129
Playing and Practice Seasons — Camps and Clinics (No. 144).....	132
Playing and Practice Seasons — Divisions I and II (No. 145).....	132
Playing and Practice Seasons — Annual Exemptions — Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer and Softball (No. 122)	133
Contest Exemptions — Division II Basketball (No. 123).....	133
Contest Exemptions — Division II Football — Pioneer Bowl (No. 124)	134
Playing and Practice Seasons — Spring Practice — Divisions I and II Football (No. 125)	135
Playing and Practice Seasons — Out-of-Season Practice — Basketball (No. 147).....	137
Playing and Practice Seasons — Outside Competition — Basketball (No. 149).....	137
Playing and Practice Seasons — Outside Teams — Water Polo (No. 128).....	138
Playing and Practice Seasons — Divisions I and II Extraordinary Personnel Losses (No. 146).....	138
Transfer — Positive Drug Test (No. 136).....	139
Resolution: Division II Championships — Automatic Qualification (No. 140).....	140
Recruiting — Electronic Transmissions — Division II (No. 106).....	143
Discussion	144
Division II Championships Project Team.....	144
Waivers	149
Closing Remarks	149
Division III Business Session	152
Opening Remarks	152
Reports	153
Presidents Commission	153
Division III Steering Committee.....	154

Championships Committee	156
Proposed Amendments	157
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division III Administrative Committee (No. 26).....	157
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division III Management Council (No. 27).....	158
NCAA Membership Restructuring — NCAA Committee Structure (No. 28)	159
Division III Membership Requirements — Sports Sponsorship Requirements (No. 54).....	160
Membership Requirements — Provisional Membership (No. 55).....	161
Division III Exception to Transfer Residence Requirement (No. 72).....	162
Maximum Contests Limitations — Division III Football (No. 77)	163
Playing and Practice Seasons — Preseason Practice — Division III Football (No. 78)	164
Playing and Practice Seasons — Preseason Practice — Division III Basketball (No. 75).....	166
Discussion	166
Continuation of Division III Business Session	180
Discussion	180
Discussion	201
Discussion	214
Continuation of Division III Business Session	226
Opening Remarks	226
Straw Vote	227
Proposed Amendments	227
Eligibility — Practice Opportunities for Olympics (No. 95).....	227
Eligibility — Hardship Waiver (No. 142).....	227
De Minimus Violations — Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 98)	228
Visit Unrelated to Recruitment — National Student-Athlete Day (No. 113)	228
Playing and Practice Seasons — Camps and Clinics (No. 144).....	229
Playing and Practice Seasons — Annual Exemptions — Baseball, Field Hockey, Ice Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer and Softball (No. 122)	229
Maximum Dates of Competition — Wrestling — Division III (No. 127)	229
Playing and Practice Seasons — Division III — Contest/Date of Competition Exemptions (No. 148).....	230
Playing and Practice Seasons — Outside Competition —Basketball (No. 149)	230
Straw Vote	230
Playing and Practice Seasons — Outside Teams — Water Polo (No. 128).....	231
Transfer — Positive Drug Test (No. 136).....	231
Resolution: First Date of Competition — Division III Cross Country, Field Hockey, Soccer and Volleyball (No. 141)	232
Reports	233
Nominating Committee	237
Straw Vote	238
Report	238
Straw Vote Results	241
Closing Remarks	241
Division I Business Session.....	244
Opening Remarks	244
Proposed Amendments	244
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Board of Directors/Management Council (No. 8)	244
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Board of	

Directors/Management Council/Cabinets (No. 9)	246
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Board of Directors (No. 12)	246
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Board of Directors (No. 13)	247
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Management Council (No. 14)	247
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Management Council (No. 15)	247
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Board of Directors/Management Council (No. 16)	248
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I-AA Governance Structure (No. 42)	248
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Board of Directors/Management Council (No. 17)	249
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Management Council (No. 18)	250
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Management Council (No. 20)	251
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Management Council Administrative Committee (No. 21)	252
NCAA Membership Restructuring — NCAA Committee Structure (No. 28)	252
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Committees (No. 32)	254
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Cabinets (No. 33)	256
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Legislative Process (No. 35)	256
Continuation of Division I Business Session	257
Proposed Amendments	257
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Legislative Process (No. 36)	257
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Legislative Process (No. 40)	258
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Legislative Process (No. 41)	258
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Legislative Process (No. 44)	258
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Interpretative Process (No. 46)	258
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Revenue Guarantee (No. 47)	259
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Waiver of Division I Revenue Guarantee (No. 48)	260
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Championships (No. 49)	260
Membership Requirements — Provisional Membership (No. 55)	260
Athletics Certification — Operating Principles (No. 57)	261
Athletics Certification — Division I (No. 58)	262
Vehicle Registration — Division I Football and Basketball (No. 60)	264
Financial Aid — Division I Employment Earnings (No. 62)	265
Continuation of Division I Business Session	271
Proposed Amendments	271
Permissible Expenses — Spouse/Children of Student-Athletes (No. 86)	271
Financial Aid — Outside Educational Grant (No. 88)	272
Pass-Fail Grades (No. 90)	273
Initial Eligibility — Core-Curriculum Requirements — Students With Disabilities (No. 91)	275
Initial Eligibility — Core-Curriculum Time Limitation (No. 92)	275

Initial Eligibility — Early Admissions Program	
Waiver (No. 93)	276
Eligibility — Practice Opportunities for Olympics (No. 95)	276
Eligibility — Hardship Waiver (No. 142)	276
Outside Competition — Division I Soccer and Women's Volleyball (No. 96)	277
De Minimus Violations — Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 98)	278
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Division I Basketball (No. 101)	278
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Division I Ice Hockey (No. 102)	279
Recruiting — Division I Ice Hockey (No. 103)	281
Recruiting — National Letter of Intent (No. 104)	282
Printed Recruiting Materials — Student-Athlete Handbook — Divisions I and II (No. 107)	282
Academic Credentials for Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period (No. 108)	282
Official Visit — Transportation (No. 109)	283
Official Visits — National Service Academies — Basketball (No. 111)	283
Unofficial Visit — Admissions Event (No. 112)	284
Visit Unrelated to Recruitment — National Student-Athlete Day (No. 113)	284
Tryout Exceptions — Golf and Tennis (No. 115)	284
Playing and Practice Seasons — Camps and Clinics (No. 144)	285
Playing and Practice Seasons — Divisions I and II (No. 145)	285
Playing and Practice Seasons — Preseason Practice — Division I Basketball (No. 118)	286
Playing and Practice Seasons — First Contest Date — Division I Women's Basketball (No. 120)	287
Playing and Practice Seasons — First Contest Date — Division I Basketball (No. 121)	287
Maximum Dates of Competition — Women's Lacrosse — Division I (No. 126)	287
Playing and Practice Seasons — Out-of-Season Practice — Basketball (No. 147)	287
Playing and Practice Seasons — Outside Competition — Basketball (No. 149)	288
Playing and Practice Seasons — Outside Teams — Water Polo (No. 128)	288
Playing and Practice Seasons — Divisions I and II Extraordinary Personnel Losses (No. 146)	289
Resolution: Division I Baseball and Softball (No. 129)	289
Athletically Related Income — Equipment and Apparel Contracts (No. 131)	290
Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel (No. 132)	290
Scouting of Opponents — Division I Women's Volleyball (No. 133)	291
Transfer — Positive Drug Test (No. 136)	291
Championships — Size of Fields/Automatic Qualification (No. 138)	291
Closing Remarks	291
NCAA Honors Dinner	293
Welcome	293
Invocation	293
Introductions	293
Today's Top VIII	294
Silver Anniversary Honorees	300

Theodore Roosevelt Award	304
Benediction	307
General Business Session.....	308
Opening Remarks	308
Proposed Amendments	308
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Delay of Effective Date (No. 7)	308
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Division I Cabinets (No. 34).....	310
NCAA Membership Restructuring — NCAA Committee Structure (No. 28)	311
Continuation of General Business Session	313
Opening Remarks	313
Proposed Amendments	314
Financial Aid — Division I Employment Earnings (No. 62).....	314
Reconsideration of Vehicle Registration — Division I Football and Basketball (No. 60)	317
NCAA Membership Restructuring — Establishment of Convention Program (No. 38)	317
NCAA Membership Restructuring — National Collegiate Championships (No. 50).....	318
Amateurism — Media Activities (No. 59)	318
Financial Aid — Division I Men's Basketball (No. 66).....	319
Initial Eligibility — Partial Qualifier — Division I (No. 67).....	321
Initial Eligibility — Partial Qualifier — Division I (No. 68).....	323
Continuation of General Business Session	326
Opening Remarks	326
Reports	326
Supplemental Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee	326
Proposed Amendments	326
Consent Package (Nos. 1-6)	327
Amateurism — Loan Against Future Earnings (No. 79).....	327
Amateurism — Basketball Draft (No. 80).....	327
Amateurism — Basketball Draft (No. 81).....	328
Amateurism — Disabling Injury or Illness (No. 82).....	328
Amateurism — Disabling Injury or Illness (No. 83).....	329
Promotional Activities — Expenses Beyond 100 Miles (No. 84)	329
Professional Sports Organizations — Sponsorship of Youth Teams (No. 85).....	330
Permissible Expenses — Meal Allowance Limitation (No. 87).....	330
Financial Aid — Exempted Government Grants (No. 89).....	331
De Minimis Violations— Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 98)	331
Playing and Practice Seasons — College-Professional Contests (No. 143).....	331
Ethical Conduct — Gambling Activities (No. 130).....	332
Conduct of Athletics Personnel — Tobacco Products (No. 134)	332
Positive Drug Test — Non-NCAA Athletics Organization (No. 135)	333
Championships — Minimum Sponsorship Criteria — Olympic Sports (No. 137)	335
Closing Remarks	338

III Appendices

A. Legislative Proposals.....	A-1
B. Roll-Call Voting	A-238
C. Convention Committees	A-282
D. Past Convention Sites	A-283
E. NCAA Officers, 1906-1997	A-285

Administrative Organization

NCAA Administrative Organization

[NOTE: The following committees and the terms of the service for individual members of those committees are subject to change, pending implementation of the Association's new governance structure.]

NCAA Joint Policy Board

The Joint Policy Board consists of the Administrative Committee, listed below, and the officers of the Presidents Commission, as listed on page 15.

NCAA Staff Liaison:

Nancy L. Mitchell (primary staff liaison)

Frank E. Marshall

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

EUGENE F. CORRIGAN

Commissioner

Atlantic Coast Conference

6011 Landmark Center Boulevard
Greensboro, North Carolina 27407

(Term Expires January 1997*)

Secretary-Treasurer

PHYLLIS L. HOWLETT

Assistant Commissioner

Big Ten Conference

1500 West Higgins Road
Park Ridge, Illinois 60068-6300

(Term Expires January 1997*)

Executive Director

CEDRIC W. DEMPSEY

6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422

Division I Vice-President: Robert M. Sweazy, Texas Tech University
(Term Expires January 1997*)

Division II Vice-President: Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University
(Term Expires January 1997*)

Division III Vice-President: Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin,
La Crosse (Term Expires January 1998*)

NCAA Staff Liaison:

Tricia Bork

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 4.1.]

Division Steering Committees: The representatives of each division on the Council make up the steering committee for each division (i.e., Division I steering committee includes all members of Division I on the Council, Division II steering committee includes all members of Division II on the Council and Division III steering committee includes all members of Division III on the Council).

Division I

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Robert J. Baugh Director of Athletics, Dean, College of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Eastern Kentucky University Richmond, Kentucky 40475-3101	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
Carol A. Cartwright President Kent State University Kent, Ohio 44242	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1997
Arthur W. Cooper Professor of Forestry North Carolina State University Raleigh, North Carolina 27695	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 2000*
George M. Dennison President University of Montana Missoula, Montana 59812-1291	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 2000*
Richard J. Ensor Commissioner Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference 1090 Amboy Avenue Edison, New Jersey 08837-2847	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1998*
Joseph A. Etzel Director of Athletics University of Portland Portland, Oregon 97203-5798	I-AAA (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*
Dennis A. Farrell Commissioner Big West Conference 2 Corporate Park, Suite 206 Irvine, California 92714	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1999*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Jeremy N. Foley Director of Athletics University of Florida Gainesville, Florida 32611	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*
Vivian L. Fuller Director of Athletics, Intramurals and Recreation Northeastern Illinois University 5500 North St. Louis Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60625	I-AAA (Region 3)	Jan. 1998*
Larry R. Gerlach Professor of History University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah 84112	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*
Mildred B. Griggs Dean, College of Education University of Illinois Champaign, Illinois 61820	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Constance H. Hurlbut Executive Director Patriot League 3897 Adler Place Building C, Suite 310 Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18017-9000	I-At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1999*
Laurence C. Keating Jr. Director of Athletics Seton Hall University South Orange, New Jersey 07079	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 2000*
Edward I. "Ted" Leland Director of Athletics Stanford University Stanford, California 94305-6150	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 2000*
Sondra Norrell-Thomas Executive Assistant to the Vice-President for Student Affairs Howard University Washington, D.C. 20059	I-At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1999*
James P. O'Hanlon Dean, Teachers College University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0234	I-A Big Twelve Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1998*
Carol J. Sprague Senior Associate Director of Athletics University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213-0436	I-A Big East Conference (Region 1)	Jan. 1999*
Robert M. Sweazy Vice-Provost for Research Texas Tech University Lubbock, Texas 79409-1035	I-A Big Twelve Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Albert Vanderbush
Director of Athletics
U.S. Military Academy
West Point, New York 10996

Claudius E. Watts III
President
The Citadel
Charleston, South Carolina 29409

Brenda Weare
Associate Commissioner
Conference USA
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Thomas E. Yeager
Commissioner
Colonial Athletic Association
8625 Patterson Avenue
Richmond, Virginia 23229-6349

I-A
Independent
(Region 1)

Jan. 2000*

I-AA
South
(Region 2)

Jan. 1997*

I-A At Large
Conference USA
(Region 2)

Jan. 1998

I-AAA
(Regions 1 and 2)

Jan. 2000*

Division II

Robert T. Becker
Director of Athletics
Saginaw Valley State University
University Center, Michigan 48710
(Region 3)

Jan. 1998*

C. Donald Cook
Director of Athletics
Sacred Heart University
Fairfield, Connecticut 06432-1000
(Region 1)

Jan. 2000*

Timothy J. Dillon
Director of Athletics
University of Alaska Anchorage
Anchorage, Alaska 99508
(Region 4)

Jan. 2000*

Lynn L. Dorn
Director of Women's Athletics
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota 58105-5600
(Region 4)

Jan. 1998*

Carol M. Dunn
Director of Athletics
California State University
Los Angeles, California 90032-8240
(Region 4)

Jan. 1999*

David P. O'Toole
Professor of Mathematics
Bellarmine College
Louisville, Kentucky 40205-0671
(Region 3)

Jan. 1997*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Shirley Green Reese
Interim Director of Athletics
Albany State College
Albany, Georgia 31705
(Region 2)

Jan. 1997*

Diane L. Reinhard
President
Clarion University
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214
(Region 1)

Jan. 1997*

Barbara J. Schroeder
Director of Athletics
Regis University
Denver, Colorado 80221-1099
(Region 4)

Jan. 2000*

Wil G. Shaw
Chair, Department of Health and Physical Education
Morehouse College
Atlanta, Georgia 30314
(Region 2)

Jan. 1999*

Kent Wyatt
President
Delta State University
Cleveland, Mississippi 38733
(Region 2)

Jan. 1999*

Division III

Name, Institution

Term Expires

Bridget Belgiovine
Director of Athletics
University of Wisconsin
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601
(Region 4)

Jan. 1998*

John S. Biddiscombe
Director of Athletics
Wesleyan University
Middletown, Connecticut 06459-0413
(Region 1)

Jan. 2000*

Stanley P. Caine
President
Adrian College
Adrian, Michigan 49221-2575
(Region 3)

Jan. 1999*

Lynda J. Calkins
Director of Athletics
Hollins College
Hollins College, Virginia 24020
(Region 3)

Jan. 2000*

Edward G. Coll Jr.
President
Alfred University
Alfred, New York 14802-1232
(Region 2)

Jan. 1997*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Mary Jo Gunning
Director of Athletics
Marywood College
Scranton, Pennsylvania 18509
(Region 2)

Linda E. Hopple
Executive Director
Middle Atlantic States Athletic Conference
Lebanon Valley College
101 North College Avenue
Annville, Pennsylvania 17003-0501
(Region 2)

Walter J. Johnson
Director of Athletics
North Central College
Naperville, Illinois 60566-7063
(Region 4)

Richard A. Rasmussen
Executive Secretary
University Athletic Association
668 Mount Hope Avenue
Rochester, New York 14620-2731
(Region 2)

Lawrence R. Schiner
Director of Athletics
and Faculty Athletics Representative
Jersey City State College
Jersey City, New Jersey 07305-1597
(Region 1)

Robert E. Williams
Director of Athletics
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania 19081-1397
(Region 2)

NCAA Staff Liaison:

Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)
Stephen R. Morgan (Division I)
Nancy L. Mitchell (Council, primary staff liaison and Division II)
Daniel T. Dutcher (Division III)
Jacqueline Hudson (Council, Division I Recording Secretary)
Mike L. Racy (Division II Recording Secretary)
Marybeth Ruskamp (Division III Recording Secretary)
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

Jan. 1999*

Jan. 1998*

Jan. 1997

Jan. 1999*

Jan. 1997*

Jan. 1998*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

Commission Chair: Samuel H. Smith
Washington State University

Division I Chair: Robert Lawless
University of Tulsa

Division II Chair: Adam W. Herbert
University of North Florida

Division III Chair: David G. Carter
Eastern Connecticut State University

Term as
Chair Expires

Jan. 1998*

Jan. 1998*

Jan. 1998*

Jan. 1997*

Division I

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Ronald G. Eaglin President Morehead State University Morehead, Kentucky 40351-1689	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*
Richard R. Eakin Chancellor East Carolina University Greenville, North Carolina 27858-4353	I-A Independent (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*
E. Gordon Gee President Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210-1357	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 2000*
Milton A. Gordon President California State University Fullerton, California 92634-9480	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1999*
James E. Halligan President Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078	I-A Big Twelve Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1999*
Carol C. Harter President University of Nevada Las Vegas, Nevada 89154	I-A At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 2000*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

John C. Hitt President University of Central Florida Orlando, Florida 32816-0002	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1998*
William E. Kirwan President University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1998*
Charles B. Knapp President University of Georgia Athens, Georgia 30602	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 2000*
Robert Lawless President University of Tulsa Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104	I-A Independent (Region 3)	Jan. 1998*
J. Barton Luedeke President Rider University Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648-3099	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1998*
Richard E. Peck President University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Rev. Nicholas S. Rashford President St. Joseph's University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*
Rev. Harold Ridley President Loyola College Baltimore, Maryland 21212	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 2000*
Kenneth A. Shaw Chancellor Syracuse University Syracuse, New York 13244-1100	I-A Big East Conference (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*
William E. Shelton President Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Samuel H. Smith President Washington State University Pullman, Washington 99164-1048	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*
Jerome H. Supple President Southwest Texas State University San Marcos, Texas 78666-4615	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 2000*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

William W. Sutton President Mississippi Valley State University Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941	I-AA At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
---	--------------------------------	------------

Rev. David T. Tyson President University of Portland Portland, Oregon 97203-5798	I-AAA At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*
---	---------------------------------	------------

To be appointed	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1997
-----------------	----------------------------	-----------

To be appointed	I-AAA At-Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1999*
-----------------	---------------------------------	------------

Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Robert A. Burnett President Armstrong Atlantic State College Savannah, Georgia 31419-1997 (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*
Anthony F. Ceddia President Shippensburg University 1871 Old Main Drive Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257-2299 (Region 1)	Jan. 1998*
Charles D. Dunn President Henderson State University Arkadelphia, Arkansas 71999-0001 (Region 2)	Jan. 2000*
Adam W. Herbert President University of North Florida Jacksonville, Florida 32224-2645 (Region 2)	Jan. 1998*
Marvalene Hughes President California State University, Stanislaus Turlock, California 95382 (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*
Gladys Styles Johnston Chancellor University of Nebraska at Kearney Kearney, Nebraska 68849 (Region 4)	Jan. 1997

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Jessica S. Kozloff
President
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania 17815
(Region 1)

Jan. 2000*

Judith A. Ramaley
President
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207-0751
(Region 4)

Jan. 1997*

Wendell G. Rayburn
President
Lincoln University
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0029
(Region 3)

Jan. 1998*

Allen Lee Sessoms
President
Queens College
Flushing, New York 11367
(Region 1)

Jan. 1999*

Albert J. Shannon
President
Saint Joseph's College
Rensselaer, Indiana 47978
(Region 3)

Jan. 2000*

Division III

Name, Institution

David L. Beckley
President
Rust College
Holly Springs, Mississippi 38635

Term Expires

Jan. 1999*

David G. Carter
President
Eastern Connecticut State University
Willimantic, Connecticut 06226
(Region 1)

Jan. 1997*

Lois B. DeFleur
President
State University of New York at Binghamton
Binghamton, New York 13902-6000
(Region 2)

Jan. 1998*

Gordon A. Haaland
President
Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325-1668
(Region 1)

Jan. 2000*

Curtis L. McCray
President
Millikin University
Decatur, Illinois 62522-2084
(Region 4)

Jan. 1997*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Michele Toleda Myers
President
Denison University
Granville, Ohio 43023
(Region 3)

Jan. 1997*

Robert W. Neff
President
Juniata College
Huntingdon, Pennsylvania 16652
(Region 2)

Jan. 2000*

L. Jay Oliva
President
New York University
New York, New York 10012-1019
(Region 2)

Jan. 1998*

Irvin D. Reid
President
Montclair State University
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043
(Region 1)

Jan. 1999*

Samuel R. Williamson
Chancellor
University of the South
Sewanee, Tennessee 37383-1000
(Region 3)

Jan. 2000*

To be appointed

Jan. 1999*

NCAA Staff Liaison:

Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)
Stephen R. Morgan (Presidents Commission, primary staff liaison and Division I)
Nancy L. Mitchell (Division II)
Daniel T. Dutcher (Division III)
Jacqueline Hudson (Division I Recording Secretary)
Mike L. Racy (Division II Recording Secretary)
Marybeth Ruskamp (Division III Recording Secretary)
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents shall be members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. [Constitution 4.2.]

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
III VP	Bridget Belgiovine Director of Athletics University of Wisconsin La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601	Jan. 1998*
III	Daniel L. Bridges Director of Athletics California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California 91125	Jan. 2001*
I-AAA	Susan A. Collins Senior Associate Director of Athletics George Mason University Fairfax, Virginia 22030	Jan. 2000*
Pres.	Eugene F. Corrigan Commissioner Atlantic Coast Conference 6011 Landmark Center Boulevard Greensboro, North Carolina 27407	Jan. 1997*
I-A	Joan C. Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37996	Jan. 1997*
II VP	Lynn L. Dorn Director of Women's Athletics North Dakota State University Fargo, North Dakota 58105	Jan. 1997*
Sec.- Treas.	Phyllis L. Howlett Assistant Commissioner Big Ten Conference 1500 West Higgins Road Park Ridge, Illinois 60068-6300	Jan. 1997*
II	William E. Lide Director of Athletics North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina 27707	Jan. 2001*
I-A	Eugene D. Smith Director of Athletics Iowa State University Ames, Iowa 50011	Jan. 2000*
I VP (I-A)	Robert M. Sweazy Vice-Provost for Research Texas Tech University Lubbock, Texas 79409-1035	Jan. 1997*

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

I-A	John D. Swofford Director of Athletics University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514	Jan. 2000*
I-AA	Patty V. Viverito Commissioner, Gateway Football Conference and Pioneer Football League 1000 St. Louis Union Station, Suite 333 St. Louis, Missouri 63103	Jan. 2000*
I-AA	H. Wright Waters Commissioner Southern Conference One West Pack Square, Suite 1508 Asheville, North Carolina 28801	Jan. 2001*
I-A	Frank Windegger Director of Athletics Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129-0001	Jan. 1998*

NCAA Staff Liaison:

Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)
Thomas W. Jernstedt (Deputy Executive Director)
Tricia Bork (Executive Committee, Division I, primary staff liaison)
Dennis L. Poppe (Division II)
Donna J. Noonan (Division III)
Frank E. Marshall (Business Affairs)
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA National Office

Executive Team

Cedric W. Dempsey, *Executive Director*
Daniel Boggan Jr., *Chief Operating Officer*
Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Deputy Executive Director*

Governance Structure Team

Stephen R. Morgan, *Chief of Staff for Division I*
Nancy L. Mitchell, *Chief of Staff for Division II*
Daniel T. Dutcher, *Chief of Staff for Division III*
Jacqueline Hudson, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division I*
Mike L. Racy, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division II*
Marybeth Ruskamp, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division III*

Executive Affairs

Louis J. Spry, *Associate Executive Director*
David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director*
Robin J. Green, *Administrator for the Committee on Infractions*
Lydia L. Sanchez, *Director of Executive Affairs*

Championships Group

Tricia Bork, *Group Executive Director for Championships*
Daniel A. Calandro, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Operations*
William R. Hancock, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*
Donna J. Noonan, *Director of Championships*
Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Championships*
R. Wayne Burrow, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Philip A. Buttafuoco, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Carl E. Daniels, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Thomas A. Jacobs, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Bernard M. Muir, *Assistant Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*
Deborah R. Nelson, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Christine M. Pohl, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Michelle A. Pond, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Cindy Smith, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Stann Tate, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Education Services Group

Ronald J. Stratten, *Group Executive Director for Education Services*
Stanley D. Johnson, *Director of Professional Development*
Janet M. Justus, *Director of Education Outreach*
Edward A. Thiebe, *Director of Youth Programs*
Frank D. Uryasz, *Director of Sports Sciences*
Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research*
Sharon K. Cessna, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Timothy M. Clark, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Rochelle M. Collins, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Randall W. Dick, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
Todd A. Petr, *Assistant Director of Research*
Cindy A. Thomas, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
To be appointed, *Sports Sciences Program Coordinator*

To be appointed, *Education Outreach Coordinator*

Enforcement and Eligibility Appeals Group

S. David Berst, *Group Executive Director for Enforcement and Eligibility Appeals*

Carrie A. Doyle, *Director of Eligibility Appeals*
Richard R. Hilliard, *Director of Enforcement*
Mark P. Jones, *Director of Enforcement*
Charles E. Smrt, *Director of Enforcement*
Dirk L. Taitt, *Director of Enforcement*

Jan A. Brown, *Enforcement Representative*
John T. Cochrane, *Enforcement Representative*
Shepard C. Cooper, *Enforcement Representative*
W. Derrick Crawford, *Enforcement Representative*
Melisa A. Dehon, *Eligibility Representative*
Kevin R. Fite, *Eligibility Representative*
Jeffrey D. Freedman, *Enforcement Representative*
Cynthia J. Gabel, *Enforcement Representative*
Stephanie J. Hannah, *Enforcement Representative*
Karl P. Hicks, *Enforcement Representative*
Thomas C. Hosty, *Enforcement Representative*
Charles A. Jones, *Eligibility Representative*
Edward B. Lupomech, *Enforcement Representative*
Les J. Pico, *Enforcement Representative*
William S. Saum, *Enforcement Representative*
Cristie A. Sexton, *Enforcement Representative*
Guy H. Troupe, *Enforcement Representative*

Finance and Business Services Group

Frank E. Marshall, *Group Executive Director for Finance and Business Services*
Eugene M. Lamb, *Director of Aviation*
Keith E. Martin, *Director of Accounting*
Michael S. McNeely, *Director of Operations*
Daniel W. Spencer, *Director of Data Processing*
Karren L. Bishop, *Programmer/Analyst*
Sarah T. Bobert, *Accountant*
Allison Brown, *Programmer/Analyst*
Dean I. Dautenhahn, *Programmer/Analyst*
De Ann M. Demo, *Assistant Human Resources Manager*
William C. Foreman, *Manager of Technical Services*
Marla B. Gleason, *Manager of Support Services*
Richard W. Hanson, *Programmer/Analyst*
Jeffrey L. Hayden, *Copilot*
Rachelle L. Hooks, *Programmer/Analyst*
Nancy L. Jesse, *Programmer/Analyst*
Suzanne M. Kerley, *Human Resources Manager*
Lynette R. Linneman, *Accountant*
Danny M. Roberts, *Programmer/Analyst*
Fannie B. Vaughan, *Executive Assistant*
James T. Wrigley, *Pilot*

Marketing, Licensing and Promotions Group

To be appointed, *Group Executive Director for Marketing, Licensing and Promotions*

Will J. Rudd, *Director of the Hall of Champions*

Alfred B. White, *Director of Promotions*

Leslie E. Drew, *Technical Director*

Jeffrey S. Hiller, *Assistant Director of the Hall of Champions*

Angie Lovett, *Licensing Coordinator*

Cynthia M. Van Matre, *Assistant Director of Promotions*

Membership Services Group

John H. Leavens, *Group Executive Director for Membership Services*

David A. Knopp, *Director of Compliance Services*

Kevin C. Lennon, *Director of Compliance Services*

Stephen A. Mallonee, *Director of Legislative Services*

Robert A. Oliver, *Director of Legislative Services*

Athena Yiamouyiannis, *Director of Legislative Services*

Troy L. Arthur, *Compliance Representative*

Rebecca G. Bowman, *Compliance Representative*

David R. Brunk, *Compliance Representative*

Janet T. Calandro, *Compliance Representative*

Carolyn M. Claude, *Compliance Representative*

Mira J. Colman, *Legislative Assistant*

Kristen L. Davis, *Legislative Assistant*

Diane E. Dickman, *Compliance Representative*

Allison Freedman, *Legislative Assistant*

Keith A. Gill, *Compliance Representative*

Carrie A. Hagwell, *Compliance Representative*

Carolayne E. Henry, *Legislative Assistant*

Jennifer L. Heppel, *Legislative Assistant*

Stacey F. Herman, *Legislative Assistant*

Shane Lyons, *Legislative Assistant*

Donna M. Mabry, *Compliance Representative*

Michael J. Marcil, *Compliance Representative*

Elizabeth Muir, *Compliance Representative*

Israel Negron, *Legislative Assistant*

Richard C. Perko, *Legislative Assistant*

N. Bea Pray, *Compliance Representative*

David W. Schnase, *Legislative Assistant*

Robert W. Thomas, *Compliance Representative*

David Thurkill, *Legislative Assistant*

Jennifer S. Vallo, *Legislative Assistant*

Public Affairs Group

To be appointed, *Group Executive Director for Public Affairs*

Doris L. Dixon, *Director of Federal Relations, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036; 202/293-3050*

Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing*

James A. Marchiony, *Director of Broadcast Services*

David Pickle, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*

Kathryn M. Reith, *Director of Public Information*

Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Constituent Communication*

Vic Royal, *Director of Graphics*

James F. Wright, *Director of Statistics*

Marty Benson, *Publications Editor*

Laurie Bollig, *Publications Editor*

Theodore A. Breidenthal, *Publications Editor*

Gary T. Brown, *Publications Editor*

Richard M. Campbell, *Statistics Coordinator*

Jack L. Copeland, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*

Christopher J. Farrow, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*

Stephen R. Hagwell, *Publications Editor*

Sally A. Huggins, *Editorial and Advertising Assistant, The NCAA News*

Gary K. Johnson, *Statistics Coordinator*

Regina L. McNeal, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*

Daniel A. Nestel, *Federal Relations Assistant*

Lee Newman, *Publishing Production Manager*

John D. Painter, *Statistics Coordinator*

Jenifer L. Scheibler, *Statistics Coordinator*

Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service, 119 West 57th Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019; 212/541-8840*

Kathy A. Short, *Circulation Manager*

Sean W. Straziscar, *Statistics Coordinator*

J. Gregory Summers, *Assistant Director of Publishing*

Vikki K. Watson, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*

■ 91st Annual Convention Delegates and Visitors

Active Member Institutions

Abilene Christian University: Stan D. Lambert, David B. Merrell, Jack Rich
 Adelphi University: Michael Givant, Robert E. Hartwell
 Adrian College: Stanley P. Caine
 Agnes Scott College: Gue P. Hudson
 Akron, University of: Michael A. Bobinski, David Jamison, Dawn Rogers, Marion A. Ruebel
 Alabama, University of, at Birmingham: Gene Bartow, Joe Davidson, Maureen Harbin, Paul Hardin, Calli Sanders, Rose Scripa
 Alabama, University of, Huntsville: James E. Harris, Clyde Riley, Michael Scarano
 Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Robert Bockrath, Gene Marsh, Marie Robbins, Andrew Sorensen, Debra P. Warren, Meredith P. Willard
 Alabama A&M University: Henry Darlington, John T. Gibson, James A. Martin
 Alabama State University: Wallace Maryland Jr., Sonia Price, W. Curtis Williams
 Alaska Anchorage, University of: Timothy J. Dillon, W. Jack Peterson
 Alaska Fairbanks, University of: Kelly J. Higgins, Gerald Shields
 Albany, University at: Gail Cummings-Danson, Milton E. Richards
 Albany State College (Georgia): Wilburn A. Campbell Jr., Shirley Green Reese
 Albertus Magnus College: Joseph A. Tonelli
 Albion College: Melvin L. Vulgamore
 Albright College: Sally A. Miller
 Alcorn State University: Clinton Bristow Jr., Norris Allen Edney, Lloyd N. Hill
 Alderson-Broaddus College: Paul A. Bennett
 Alfred University: Edward G. Coll Jr., Kenneth Hassler
 Allegheny College: Maureen Hager
 Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales: Joy M. Richman
 Alma College: Tammy Lynn Anderson
 Alvernia College: Adam Hertz, Sandra Slabik
 American International College: Robert E. Burke
 American University: Benjamin Ladner, Lee A. McElroy, Barbara J. Reimann, Nina M. Roscher
 American University of Puerto Rico: Juan C. Nazario
 Amherst College: Suzanne J. Everden
 Anderson University (Indiana): A. Barrett Bates, Rebecca A. Hull
 Angelo State University: Kathleen Brasfield, James Hindman, Michael P. Ryan, Jerry Vandergriff
 Anna Maria College: Stephen C. Washkevich
 Appalachian State University: Alan J. Hauser, Roachel J. Laney, Debbie

Richardson
 Arizona, University of: M. Paul Capp, Kathleen L. LaRose, Jim Livengood, William M. Morgan
 Arizona State University: Jill W. DeMichele, Jerry L. Kingston, Betsy J. Mosher, Kevin M. White
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: Howard Brill, Randy Cale, Daniel E. Ferritor, Beverly R. Lewis, Tracey Mays Stehlik
 Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Van Compton, Charles E. Hathaway, Gary A. Heidt, Rick Mello
 Arkansas State University: D. Barry Dowd, Sam R. Gennuso, Jason Wilkie, Leslie Wyatt
 Armstrong Atlantic State University: Eddie Aenchbacher, John G. Brewer, Robert A. Burnett
 Ashland University: G. William Benz, Sue Martensen, William J. Weidner, Robert L. Wendling
 Assumption College: Rita M. Castagna, Joseph H. Hagan
 Auburn University: Barbara L. Camp, David A. Didion, David Housel, Jane B. Moore, William V. Muse, Dennis Wilson
 Augusta State University: William A. Bloodworth, Clint Bryant, Mary Lisko
 Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell, Bruce R. McCart
 Augustana College (South Dakota): Bill Gross, Mel Klein
 Aurora University: Mark Walsh
 Austin Peay State University: E. Kaye Hart, C. Bruce Myers, Sal D. Rinella
 Averett College: Vesa Hiltunen
 Babson College: Frank Millerick
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone
 Ball State University: Richard J. Falls, David Land, John E. Reno, Andrea Seger, John E. Worthen
 Bard College: Kristen E. Hall
 Barry University: G. Jean Cerra, Mike Covone
 Barton College: Gary W. Hall
 Bates College: Suzanne R. Coffey
 Baylor University: Paul Bradshaw, David Guinn, Tom Stanton
 Beaver College: Shirley M. Liddle
 Bellarmine College: Jay Gardiner, Joseph J. McGowan Jr., David P. O'Toole
 Bemidji State University: James L. Richards
 Benedictine University: John P. Welty, James Krause
 Bennett College: Loris Groover, Carl A. Bibbs
 Bentley College: Sandra P. Hoffman
 Bernard M. Baruch College: Helen F. Belden, William Eng
 Bethany College (West Virginia): Wallace B. Neel
 Bethel College (Minnesota): David Klostreich
 Bethune-Cookman College: Jno. S. Frink, W. Floyd Laisure, Lynn W. Thompson
 Binghamton, State University of New York at: Alicia G. Brewster, Lois B. DeFleur, Sheryl Sousa, Joel Thirer
 Blackburn College: Geraldine Albins
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Preston Herring,

Jessica S. Kozloff, Burt Reese
 Bluefield State College: John S. Duffy
 Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Carol Ladwig, Marcia Wicklow-Howard
 Boston College: Tobin Dominick, Chester S. Gladchuk, Lynn K. Holleran, Kim Hollins, Joseph F. Quinn
 Boston University: Averill C. Haines, Gary Strickler
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
 Bowie State University: Willie J. Nichols
 Bowling Green State University: Shelley Appelbaum, Marvin L. Kumler, Sidney A. Ribeau, Ronald E. Zwiernie
 Bradley University: John R. Brazil, Craig Dahlquist, Virnette House, Kenneth E. Kavanagh, Ron Koperski
 Brandeis University: Barbara Bickford, Jeffrey W. Cohen
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Thomas M. Kinder
 Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): John C. Harper, Susan Crosby Tange
 Brigham Young University: Merrill J. Bateman, Rondo Fehlberg, Barbara Day Lockhart, Elaine Michaelis, Pete Witbeck
 Brockport, State University College at: Linda J. Case, Susan A. Hoffman, Ginny L. Studer
 Brown University: Amy Craiglow, Julie Riccardelli, David T. Roach, Joan W. Taylor
 Bryant College: Linda C. Hackett
 Bryn Mawr College: Jeneffer P. Shillingford
 Bucknell University: William D. Adams, Rick Hartzell, Timothy W. Sweeney
 Buena Vista College: Benjamin Donath, Roger Egland, Marge Willadsen
 Buffalo, State University of New York at: Michael J. Gentile, William R. Greiner, Nanette Harvey, Dennis P. Malone, Bridget Niland, Nelson E. Townsend
 Buffalo, State University College at: Gail F. Maloney, Muriel A. Moore, Hal D. Payne
 Butler University: Geoffrey Bannister, Jona Braden, Joseph L. Kirsch, John C. Parry

 California, University of, Berkeley: Jack Citrin, Christine A. Dawson, John V. Kasser, Horace Mitchell, Chang-Lin Tien
 California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill-Fisher, Jerry Henderson, Melvin R. Ramey, Greg Warzecka
 California, University of, Irvine: Khalid Channel, Daniel G. Guerrero, Petrina M. Long, Lyman W. Porter
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter Dalis, Richard W. Herczog, Donald G. Morrison, Betsy G. Stephenson
 California, University of, Riverside: Robert W. Gill, Sue Gozansky, Anthony W. Norman, Raymond L. Orbach
 California, University of, San Diego: Marilyn Hill, Judith M. Sweet
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Steven Allaback, Gary A. Cunningham, Alice Henry
 California Institute of Technology: Daniel L. Bridges
 California Lutheran University: Bruce Bryde
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Alison Cone,

John F. McCutcheon, Michael J. Wenzl
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Frank Gibbons, Karen L. Miller
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal
 California State University, Chico: Anita Barker, Don W. Batie
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: William Blischke, Harold Charnofsky, Ronald D. Prettyman, Julie Sandoval
 California State University, Fresno: Allen R. Bohl, Scott Johnson, Penni E. Key, Diane Milutinovich, Peter Simis, John D. Welty
 California State University, Fullerton: Judith A. Anderson, John Easterbrook, Leon Gilbert, Milton A. Gordon, Maryalyce Jeremiah
 California State University, Hayward: Armando Gonzales, F. Douglas Weiss
 California State University, Los Angeles: David Thomas
 California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, Paul A. Bubb, Ronald R. Kopita, Thomas J. Shannon
 California State University, Sacramento: Judith A. Davidson, Irene Shea, Shirley Uplinger
 California State University, San Bernardino: Barry Knight, Todd S. Markel, Nancy Simpson
 California State University, Stanislaus: Joseph T. Donahue, Isidro "Zeke" Duque, Marvalene Hughes, Wayne Pierce
 California University of Pennsylvania: Glenn Lewis, Thomas G. Pucci
 Calvin College: Beverly Klooster, Nancy Meyer
 Cameron University: Sam Carroll, B. Don Sullivan, Kim Vinson
 Campbell University: Susan A. Berner, Tom Collins, L. T. Easley
 Canisius College: Vincent M. Cooke, Daniel P. Starr
 Capital University: James L. Burke
 Carleton College: Leon Lunder
 Carnegie Mellon University: John H. Harvey, Joan E. Maser
 Carroll College (Wisconsin): Chad O. Hardy, Merle Masonholder
 Carson-Newman College: David W. Barger, Jerry Blaylock, Ross Brummett, Rusty Hollingsworth
 Carthage College: Robert Bonn
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, David M. Hutter, Glenn Nicholls
 Catawba College: Ginger Crissman-Ashley, Dennis Davidson, Karl Hales, Nan Whitley
 Catholic University: Jone Dowd
 Centenary College (Louisiana): Harold Christensen, Russ A. Sharp, Kenneth L. Schwab
 Central Arkansas, University of: Bill E. Stephens
 Central College (Iowa): Sam Bedrosian, Marjorie B. Giles, Kenneth J. Weller
 Central Connecticut State University: Michael Ansarra, Charles Jones Jr., Frank R. A. Resnick, Robert E. Trichka
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, John C. Hitt, Mary J. Kaufman, Steve Sloan, Art W. Zeleznik
 Central Michigan University: James W. Damitio, Herb Deromedi, Russ Herron, Marcy Weston
 Central Missouri State University: Ed Elliott, Paul H. Engelmann, Jerry M. Hughes

Central Oklahoma, University of: Jeff McKibbin, John E. Wagnon, J. W. Weatherford
 Centre College: Michael F. Adams, Kitty R. Baird, Brian Chafin, Michael E. Hammond, Ray K. Hammond, Bill Johnston
 Chadron State College: Bradley R. Smith
 Chaminade University: Wayne M. Tanna
 Chapman University: David Currey
 Charleston, College of (South Carolina): Jerry Baker, Otto German, William V. Moore
 Charleston, University of (West Virginia): Jerry Forster
 Charleston Southern University: W. Howard Bagwell, Steve Hudson, Susan Peal
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson, W. Clinton Pettus
 Chicago, University of: Starkey Duncan, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus, Thomas Weingartner, Susan M. Zawacki
 Chicago State University: Barbara J. Farnandis, Kevin McCray, Joell B. Mitchell, Charles N. Smith
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Vincent G. Ille, Heather Lyke, Gerald K. O'Dell, Jim Schaus, Joseph A. Steger
 Citadel, The: Walter Nadzak, Col. Gerald L. Runey, Ed Steers, Lt. Gen. Claudius E. Watts III
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: David Wells
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Tracy Cumming, Iseli K. Krauss, Diane L. Reinhard
 Clark Atlanta University: Jean Bell Chandler, Richard Cosby, Philip L. Hood
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda S. Moulton
 Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty
 Clemson University: Cecil O. Huey Jr., Steven D. Nelson, Dwight Rainey, Robert W. Robinson Jr., Linda Edwards White
 Cleveland State University: Alice J. Khol, John Konstantinos, Douglas O. Stewart, Claire Van Ummersen
 Coastal Carolina University: Andy Hendrick, Ronald R. Ingle, George F. Sasser, Chris Wright
 Coe College: J. Barron Bremner
 Coker College: C. Timothy Griggs
 Colby-Sawyer College: Deborah McGrath
 Colgate University: Kenneth P. Gamble, Braden Houston, Scott Kraly, Janet A. Little, Joe Manhertz, Mark H. Murphy
 College Misericordia: Michael W. Mould
 Colorado, University of, Boulder: Judith E. N. Albino, Joyce Aschenbrenner, Rich Cardillo, James N. Corbridge Jr., Jim Martin, Richard Tharp
 Colorado, University of, Colorado Springs: Theophilus D. Gregory, Linda Bunnell Shade
 Colorado Christian University: Stanley Dyck, Brian R. Fort, Dave Foster, Laura Rush, Linda Rush, Ronald R. Schmidt
 Colorado College: Susan Ashley, Roxanne Dale, Martin Scarano
 Colorado School of Mines: John A. Hogan, Marvin L. Kay
 Colorado State University: Tom Jurich, Marsha Smeltzer, Christine Susemihl
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Jacqueline P. Blackett, Merry L.

Ormsby, John A. Reeves
 Columbus State University: Frank D. Brown
 Concord College: Ron Burgher, Donald P. Christie
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Carlton Paulson, Armin Piphio
 Concordia College (New York): Ivan Marquez
 Concordia University (Illinois): George C. Heider
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Allen, Pat Babcock, Jerry A. Hathaway, Lewis Perkins, Cindy Pittner
 Connecticut College: Fran Shields
 Coppin State College: Chandra V. Bierwirth, Desney G. Byrd
 Cornell College: Tony deLaubenfels, Ellen Whale
 Cornell University: Virginia Augusta, Dawn M. Darby, Bernie DePalma, Charley H. Moore, M. Dianne Murphy, Andy Noel
 Cortland, State University College at: Dolores A. Bogard, A. Lee Roberts
 Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Mary Higgins, Bruce D. Rasmussen
 Curry College: Pamela S. Samuelson
 Daniel Webster College: Terry M. Prouty
 Dartmouth College: Gretchen Boehm, Jo Ann Harper, Richard G. Jaeger, Jo-Ann Nester
 Davidson College: Thomas A. Kazee, John W. Kuykendall, James E. Murphy
 Davis and Elkins College: Dorothy MacConkey, Will Shaw
 Dayton, University of: Katrina Banks, George A. Bohlen, R. Elaine Dreidame, Ted Kissell, Megan McCallister, Tim Wabler
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson
 Delaware State University: Joe W. Burden, William Collick, William B. DeLauder, Tommy L. Frederick, Dwayne H. Henry
 Delaware Valley College: Frank Wolfgang
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Jim Jordan, Kent Wyatt
 Denison University: Michele Tolela Myers, Lynn Schweizer
 Denver, University of: Joel Maturi, Bernard J. Mullin, Daniel L. Ritchie, Nancy S. Sampson, Diane T. Wendt
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, James Doyle, Jeanne LaDuke, Jean Lenti Ponsetto
 DePauw University: S. Page Cotton
 Detroit Mercy, University of: Brad Bertani, Brad Kinsman, Martha R. Soleau
 Dickinson College: Leslie J. Poolman, Judy Yorio
 District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Dwight F. Datcher, Britt King
 Dowling College: Robert Dranoff, Karrie A. Farrell
 Drake University: Donald Adams, Jean Berger, Lynn King, Keith C. Miller
 Drew University: Christa Aluotto, Vincent Masco, Connee Zotos
 Drexel University: Johnson D. Bowie, Anthony T. Caneris, Louis M. Marciani, Lynn M. Tubman, Eric Zillmer
 Drury College: Penny Clayton, Barbara Cowherd, Bruce Harger
 Dubuque, University of: Connie Bandy Hodge
 Duke University: Christopher Kennedy, Jaclyn E. Silar

Duquesne University: William P. Buzzi, Brian Colleary

Earlham College: Frank Carr, Porter G. Miller

East Carolina University: Richard R. Eakin, Mike Hamrick, Ernest W. Schwarz, Rosie Thompson

East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Earl W. Edwards, Diane Husic, Carey J. Snyder

East Tennessee State University: Kelly E. Andrews, Charles E. Clark, Randy Eaton, Joy Hassell

Eastern Connecticut State University: Jacqueline Abbott, David G. Carter, Sharlene A. Peter

Eastern Illinois University: Louis V. Hencken, David L. Jorns, Deborah M. Polca, Gail J. Richard, Jerome P. Rodgers

Eastern Kentucky University: Robert J. Baugh, H. Hanly Funderburk Jr., Janna P. Vice, Betty Werner, Charles D. Whitlock

Eastern Mennonite College: Lester R. Zook

Eastern Michigan University: John R. Adams, Carole J. Huston, Lee Reed, Juanita M. Reid, William E. Shelton, Tim L. Weiser

Eastern New Mexico University: Thurman Elder, B. B. Lees

Eastern Washington University: Ken Dolan, John Johnson, Frank E. Nelson

Eckerd College: James R. Harley

Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Todd W. Henne, Todd V. Jay, Jody E. Morradian

Elizabeth City State University: Edward McLean, William A. Porter

Elizabethtown College: Tina Hill, Nancy J. Latimore

Elmhurst College: Christopher M. Ragsdale

Elon College: Robert C. Hassard, Vicki Hightower, Alan J. White, J. Fred Young

Emerson College-Massachusetts College of Art: Joseph T. Walsh

Emory and Henry College: Louis Wacker

Emory University: Cathy Benton, Chuck Gordon, Sandy Tillman

Emporia State University: Robert E. Glennen, Wilma Kasnic, William W. Quayle, John C. Rich

Endicott College: Larry R. Hiser

Erskine College: Joseph "Chip" Sherer, James W. Strobel

Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, J. Robert Knott, Laura Tietjen, James S. Vinson

Fairfield University: Eugene P. Doris, Tracey Flynn, Milo W. Peck Jr.

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: William T. Klika Jr., Carl Viola

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Ann Gulino, Gerald A. Oswald, Richard Panicucci

Fairmont State College: Colin T. Cameron

Fayetteville State University: Peggy L. Green, Clarence White Jr.

Ferris State University: Tom Kirinovic, Larry J. Marfise

Ferrum College: Ted M. Kinder

Fisk University: George Neely Jr.

Fitchburg State College: Sue E. Lauder

Florida, University of: Jeremy N. Foley, John V. Lombardi, E. James McCloskey, Ann Marie Rogers

Florida A&M University: Cynthia Dupont-Jones, Jonathan Evans,

Frederick S. Humphries, Ken Riley

Florida Atlantic University: Thomas Cargill, Anthony J. Catanese, Ed Hayward, Joan Joyce, Jerry Lafferty, Emmanuel Newsome, Bob Vanatta

Florida Institute of Technology: William K. Jurgens

Florida International University: Theodore A. Aceto, Annagrace Collins, Joyce Elam, Robert "Tony" O'Neal

Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly

Florida State University: Charles L. Carr, Charles W. Ehrhardt, David R. Hart Jr., Robert J. Minnix, Kim Record

Fontbonne College: Lee McKinney

Fordham University: George Bisacca, Barbara Ellen Black, Francis X. McLaughlin, Marianne Reilly

Fort Hays State University: Edward H. Hammond, Thomas E. Spicer

Fort Lewis College: Joel M. Jones, Duane A. Smith, Joel R. Smith Jr., Harlan Steinle

Fort Valley State College: Fred Harrison Jr., Douglas T. Porter, Oscar L. Prater, Gwendolyn Reeves

Framingham State College: Thomas M. Kelley

Francis Marion College: R. Gerald Griffin, Lee A. Vickers

Franklin and Marshall College: John A. Andrew, William A. Marshall

Franklin College: Thomas R. Hodge

Franklin Pierce College: Bruce Kirsch

Fredonia, State University College at: Charles Davis, William E. Leslie, Thomas E. Prevet

Frostburg State College: Susan Arisman, Loyal K. Park

Furman University: Charles L. Alford, John M. Block, John Burns, David E. Shi

Gallaudet University: Richard L. Pelletier, Peg Worthington

Gannon University: Michael Corbett, Richard Dunford, Ronald F. Pauline

Gardner-Webb University: Jeff Tubbs

Geneseo, State University College at: Karen L. Pennington, John L. Spring

George Mason University: Susan A. Collins, Michael G. Emsley, Thomas J. O'Connor

George Washington University: Edward A. Caress, Robert A. Chernak, Susie Jones, Jack Kvancz, Mary Jo Warner

Georgetown University: Adam Brick, Joseph Lang, Patricia A. Thomas

Georgia, University of: Gary Couvillon, Vincent J. Dooley, Charles B. Knapp, Hoke Wilder

Georgia College and State University: Stan Aldridge, Sondi M. Creglow, Jerry Fly, Bruce Harshbarger, Duward Whelchel

Georgia Institute of Technology: Bernadette V. McGlade, Ida Neal-Smith, George Nemhauser, Charles Wiley

Georgia Southern University: Sam Baker, Brenda S. Carter, Harry S. Carter, Richard Rogers, Hank Schomber, G. Lane Van Tassell

Georgia State University: Blaine Hughes, James H. Maxey, Orby Moss Jr., Carl V. Patton

Gettysburg College: Gordon A. Haaland, Charles W. Winters

Glenville State College: Kenneth W. Osborne

Gonzaga University: John J. Preston

Gordon College: Walter Bowman
 Goucher College: Geoffrey M. Miller, Debra Sherwin
 Grambling State University: Wilbert Ellis, Raymond A. Hicks, A. Lane Howell, Robert L. Piper
 Grand Canyon University: B. Keith Baker, Kris Naber, Kathy Neville
 Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Arend D. Lubbers, Tim W. Selgo, Danielle S. Tiernan, Donald W. VanderJagt
 Greensboro College: Kim A. Strable
 Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild, Gregory A. Wallace
 Grove City College: Christopher W. Smith
 Guilford College: Michael R. Ketchum
 Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist

Hamilton College: Geri Knortz
 Hampden-Sydney College: Joe Bush, Anthony Carilli
 Hampton University: Lenora E. Armstrong, Dennis E. Thomas
 Hanover College: Lynn Hall, Dick Naylor, Russell L. Nichols
 Hardin-Simmons University: Lanny Hall, John Neese
 Hartford, University of: Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett, Janna Venice, S. Edward Weinswig
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler
 Harvard University: William J. Cleary Jr., Patricia Henry, Harry R. Lewis, Marcella K. Zalot
 Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley
 Hawaii, University of, at Hilo: William R. Trumbo
 Hawaii, University of, Manoa: Kaia Hedlund, Stephen L. Martin, Marilyn Moniz-Kahoochanohano, Hugh Yoshida
 Heidelberg College: Martin Reno
 Henderson State University: Charles D. Dunn, David Gardner, Kenneth J. Turner
 Hendrix College: W. Dwayne Collins, Ann H. Die, Cliff Garrison, George Sims
 High Point University: Mike Tuttle
 Hillsdale College: Michael J. Kovalchik
 Hiram College: Bob Thomas
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Susan Bassett, Joseph M. Berta, Michael J. Hanna
 Hofstra University: James V. Garvey, Cindy Lewis
 Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins
 Holy Cross College: Ronald S. Perry, Rose Shea
 Hope College: Raymond E. Smith
 Houston, University of: James Bandy, William C. Carr, Glenn A. Goerke, Diane Howell, Bill McGillis, Richard W. Scamell
 Howard Payne University: Mike Blackwell
 Howard University: Steve Favors, Hank Ford, Morris Hawkins Jr., Sondra Norrell-Thomas, Altha B. Williamson
 Humboldt State University: Gail J. Fults, Dennis L. Geyer, Scott Nelson
 Hunter College: Terry A. Wansart

Idaho, University of: Kathy D. Clark, L. Oval Jaynes, David Van Over
 Idaho State University: Irvin A. Cross, Nancy Graziano, Cornelius A. Hofman

Illinois, University of, Champaign: Michael Aiken, Rick Allen, David L. Chicoine, Mildred B. Griggs, Ronald E. Guenther, Karol A. Kahrs
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Tonya M. McGowan, James W. Schmidt, Kenneth E. Surma
 Illinois College: Richard A. Johanningmeier
 Illinois State University: Richard Greenspan, Albert D. Otto, David A. Strand
 Illinois Wesleyan University: Barbara Cothren
 Indiana State University: Larry Gallo Jr., Andrea Myers, Robert E. Thompson
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Clarence H. Doninger, Jennifer Hooker, William C. Perkins
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, Harold "Pete" Goldsmith, Frances A. Nee, Lawrence K. Pettit, John C. Thomas Jr.
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Robert A. Barrett, Daniel L. Gebhart, Stanley "Butch" Perchan
 Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis: Linda F. Carroll, William N. Kulsrud, Michael Moore
 Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, David Huffman
 Iona College: Rich Petriccione
 Iowa, University of: Robert A. Bowlsby, Mary Sue Coleman, Mary C. Curtis, Christine H. B. Grant, W. Fred Mims, Yvonne L. Slatton
 Iowa State University: Murray Blackwelder, J. Elaine Hieber, Eugene D. Smith
 Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Kristen Ford, Bonnie J. Gordon, John B. Oblak, James J. Whalen

Jackson State University: Paul E. Covington, Melvin I. Evans, Sadie E. Magee, Gene C. Young
 Jacksonville State University: Greg Bonds, Hope P. Davis, James Hobbs, Harold J. McGee, Marilyn Osborne
 Jacksonville University: Pennie C. Brown, Thomas M. Seitz
 James Madison University: Ashlie C. Kite, Donald L. Lemish, Janet D. Lucas, Frank Luth, Dennis E. Robison
 Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner
 John Carroll University: Anthony J. DeCarlo, Gretchen Weitbrecht
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Robert A. Fox
 Johns Hopkins University: Thomas P. Calder, Tim Downes
 Johnson C. Smith University: Debra D. Frazier
 Juniata College: Jill M. LaPoint, Robert W. Neff

Kalamazoo College: Robert L. Kent
 Kansas, University of: Robert E. Frederick, Don Green, Janelle Martin, Amy P. Perko
 Kansas State University: Jim Epps, Cindy Fox, Robert S. Krause, Robert R. Snell, Max F. Urlick, Jon Wefald
 Kean College: Glenn Hedden
 Keene State College: John C. Ratliff
 Kennesaw State College: Dave Waples
 Kent State University: Carol A. Cartwright, Judy Devine, Laing E. Kennedy, William Konnert, James R. Watson
 Kentucky, University of: Sandra D. Bell, C. M. Newton, John J. Piccoro

Jr., Charles T. Wethington Jr.
 Kentucky State University: Philip Booker, Betty M. Gibson, Donald W. Lyons, Mary L. Smith
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: William J. Meadors, Wesley H. Poling, James E. Welch
 Kenyon College: Robert D. Bunnell
 Keuka College: Nancy Wightman
 King's College: John J. Dorish, Cheryl Ish
 Knox College: Harlan Knosher
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Kimberly Keenan, Anthony A. Matz, David McFarland

 La Salle University: Brother Joseph F. Burke, Kathleen M. McNally, Robert Mullen, Annette O'Connor
 La Verne, University of: Jimmy M. Paschal, Rick Simon
 Lafayette College: Eve Atkinson, Herman C. Kissiah, Bruce E. McCutcheon
 Lake Forest College: Jackie A. Slaats
 Lake Superior State University: William J. Crawford, Jill Wetthuhn
 Lamar University: Hsing-Wei Chu, Rex L. Cottle, Laura B. Myers, Michael E. O'Brien
 Lander College: Jeff May, William C. Moran, Betty H. Williams
 Lane College: J. L. Perry
 Lawrence University: Rick Coles
 Le Moyne College: Richard W. Rockwell
 Lebanon Valley College: Louis A. Sorrentino, Kathleen Tierney
 Lees-McRae College: Ried M. Estus, Mary W. White
 Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Joseph D. Sterrett
 Lehman College: Martin L. Zwirn
 Lenoir-Rhyne College: Rufus L. Moretz, Keith Ochs, Joseph L. Smith
 Lewis University: Raphael Mascari, Paul Ruddy
 Liberty University: Chuck Burch, Kim Graham, A. Pierre Guillermin
 Lincoln University (Missouri): Ronald E. Coleman, Donald L. Mullett, Mary Beth Ochsner, David L. Shinholster
 Livingstone College: Clifton Huff, Bernell Jones
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Sharon E. Taylor
 Long Beach State University: David Bernstein, Cindy Masner, Bill Shumard, Mary Ann Tripodi
 Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus: Margaret Alaimo, Alan Chaves, Ralph Engelman, Bernard W. Sullivan
 Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone
 Longwood College: Tom Bilello, Patricia P. Cormier
 Loras College: Daniel J. Allen, Robert G. Bierie
 Louisiana State University: David "Bo" Bahnsen, Debbie P. Corum, Pat Culbertson, Joe Dean, William L. Jenkins
 Louisiana Tech University: Jerry W. Andrews, Mary Kay Hungate, Jim M. Oakes, Daniel D. Reneau
 Louisville, University of: Beatrice Crane, Kevin Miller, William C. Olsen, Arthur M. Riehl, John W. Shumaker
 Loyola College (Maryland): Diane M. Aikens, Joseph Boylan, Rev. Harold E. Ridley, Steve Walters
 Loyola Marymount University: Lane Bove, Brian Quinn, Pamela Wettig

Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn V. O'Connell, Samuel P. Ramenofsky, Charles T. Schwarz
 Luther College: Joe Thompson
 Lynchburg College: Joanne R. Lehman, Jack M. Toms
 Lynn University: Richard A. Young

 Macalester College: John Leaney
 Maine, University of: George L. Jacobson, Tammy Light, Suzanne J. Tyler
 Maine Maritime Academy: William Mottola, Leonard Tyler Jr.
 Manchester College: Tom Jarman, Martha Judge, David P. Kreps
 Manhattan College: Robert J. Byrnes, E. Joseph Lee, Sandra Sapone, Brother Thomas J. Scanlan
 Manhattanville College: Karen Peterson
 Mankato State University: Don Amiot, Georgene Brock, Ronald L. Hybertson, Richard R. Rush
 Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Roger N. Maisner
 Marietta College: Jeanne Arbuckle, Debora Lazorik, Lauren R. Wilson
 Marist College: Timothy S. Murray, John T. Ritschdorff, Alison Sexton
 Maritime College, State University of New York: James Migli
 Marquette University: William L. Cords, Gregory J. Naples, Kathryn Statz, Rev. Robert A. Wild
 Mars Hill College: Ed Hoffmeyer
 Marshall University: Barbara Burke, Joyce Y. Howse, Robert Sawrey, Lance West
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Charles R. Brown, Freeman Hrabowski, John A. Kloetzel, Charles Woolston, Kathleen G. Zerlout
 Maryland, University of, College Park: William E. Kirwan, Patricia D. Nicol, Lee Vander Velden, Charles F. Wellford, Deborah A. Yow
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Dorothy Body, Henry M. Brooks, Hallie E. Gregory, Darryl Pope
 Marymount University (Virginia): William Finney
 Maryville University of St. Louis: Julie Beckerman, Lonnie Folks, David R. Pierce
 Marywood College: Mary Jo Gunning
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: Howard M. Davis, Robert K. Marcum, John D. Nitardy, Glenn M. Wong
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary Barrett, Charlie Titus
 Massachusetts, University of, Dartmouth: Peter H. Cressy, Kenneth McBryde, Judith A. Sullivan
 Massachusetts, University of, at Lowell: Jon C. Hellstedt, Dana K. Skinner
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Richard A. Hill
 Massachusetts Maritime Academy: Robert Corradi
 McNeese State University: Tommy E. Bogle, H. Sonny Watkins
 Memphis, University of: Nathan Essex, R. C. Johnson, Lynn Parkes, V. Lane Rawlins, Timothy L. Sumner, Nicholas L. White
 Mercer University: R. Kirby Godsey, Benjamin S. Kelley, Bobby Pope
 Mercyhurst College: Peter J. Russo
 Merrimack College: Robert M. DeGregorio Jr.
 Mesa State College: James F. Paronto
 Messiah College: Lori L. Braa
 Metropolitan State College of Denver: Joseph Arcese, William Helman

Miami, University of (Florida): Craig W. Angelos, Antonio T. Coley, Paul Dee, Maureen Lantz, Lawrence G. Wahl
 Miami University (Ohio): James C. Garland, Eric Hyman, Harold W. Jasper, Karen Womack
 Michigan, University of: Percy Bates, Margaret J. Bradley-Doppes, John P. Hardt, Kevin Hatcher, Joe Roberson, John "Fritz" Seyferth Jr.
 Michigan State University: Michael L. Kasavana, Merritt J. Norvell Jr.
 Michigan Technological University: Mary Kaminski, Darrell W. Smith, Curtis J. Tompkins, J. Richard Yeo
 Middle Tennessee State University: Race P. Bergman, Lee G. Fowler, Wendy Thompson, Diane C. Turnham, James E. Walker
 Middlebury College: Gail D. Smith
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Gene A. Carpenter, Thomas Greco, Robert Thomas, Marjorie A. Trout
 Millikin University: Lori Kerans, Curtis L. McCray
 Millsaps College: Shannon Carlson, George M. Harmon, Ron Jurney
 Milwaukee School of Engineering: Daniel I. Harris
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Gregory Fox, Linda M. Larson, Patricia A. Merrier
 Minnesota, University of, Morris: Mark Fohl
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: McKinley Boston, Norman Chervany, Mark Dienhart, Jeff Schemmel, Christopher Schoemann, Mariah Snyder, Chris Voelz
 Mississippi, University of: James T. "Pete" Boone, Robert C. Khayat, Robert A. Weems, David K. Wells, Max W. Williams
 Mississippi College: Terry McMillan, Sid Moller, Howell W. Todd
 Mississippi State University: Kirk Arnett, David C. Boles, Samye Johnson, Larry O. Templeton, Donald W. Zacharias
 Mississippi University for Women: Jo Spearman
 Mississippi Valley State University: Pauline Banks, John E. Johnson, Charles Prophet
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Joseph R. Castiglione, Derrick Gragg, Sarah K. Reesman, Carl Settergren, Richard L. Wallace
 Missouri, University of, Kansas City: J. Joseph Doerr, Ed Grom, Lee Hunt, Eleanor B. Schwartz
 Missouri, University of, Rolla: Lawrence O. Christensen, Mark E. Mullin, John T. Park, Sarah Preston
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Patricia A. Dolan, Thomas R. Schnell
 Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, James L. Frazier, Julio S. Leon
 Missouri Western State College: James W. Grechus, Don Kaverman, Mary M. Nichols
 Molloy College: Robert C. Houlihan
 Monmouth College (New Jersey): Joan Martin, Marilyn McNeil, Marilyn A. Parker, Rebecca Stafford
 Montana, University of: George M. Dennison, Marie Hibbard, Wayne Hogan, James J. Lopach
 Montana State University-Billings: Gary R. Gray, Russell H. Lord, Eric Schoh
 Montana State University-Bozeman: Susan M. Jacobson, Charles N. Lindemann, Michael P. Malone, Robert G. Oakberg, Allen Yarnell
 Montclair State University: Holly P. Gera, Irvin D. Reid

Moorhead State University: Steven V. Butler, Katy Wilson
 Moravian College: John Makuvek
 Morehead State University: W. Michael Brown, Ronald G. Eaglin, Steve A. Hamilton, Kathleen R. Worthington
 Morehouse College: Josh Culbreath, Wil G. Shaw
 Morgan State University: Delise O'Meally, Garnett H. Purnell, Charles R. Salters
 Morningside College: Bill Goldring, Beth Sibenaller, Molly Williams
 Morris Brown College: Beverly Arnaud, Gene Bright, Johnnie Dumas Myers, Willie Williams
 Mount Holyoke College: Laurie Priest, Lynne Wilkie
 Mount Olive College: Willis A. Brown Jr., J. William Bryd, Allen M. Cassell
 Mount St. Mary College (New York): John J. Wright
 Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland): George R. Houston, Harold P. Menninger, Lynne P. Robinson, George H. Williams
 Mount Union College: Sandra Douglas, Truman Turnquist
 Muhlenberg College: Stephen P. Erber, Connie R. Kunda
 Murray State University: Margaret Simmons
 Nazareth College: William H. Carey, Annette Shapiro
 Nebraska, University of, at Kearney: Richard M. Dull, Bruce Elder, Gladys Styles Johnston, Brent W. Robinson, Patty Sitorius
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Don Bryant, Bill Byrne, Theodore Harris, Barbara A. Hibner, Dennis Leblanc, James Moeser, James P. O'Hanlon, Al Papik, Kristin Whitted
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie J. Claussen, Bob Danenhauer, Richard B. Flynn, Don Leahy, Del D. Weber
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Stuart M. Spero, Christy J. Wilson
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Charles Cavagnaro, David Chambers, Daron Dorsey, Carol C. Harter, Lisa A. Kelleher, Myrlene LaMancusa, Mark Richard
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Chris Ault, Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline, Angela D. Taylor
 New England College: Mary Allen Alger
 New Hampshire, University of: John H. Lawson, Joan R. Leitzel, David O'Connor, Judith L. Ray
 New Hampshire College: Joseph R. "Chip" Polak
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, Robin Salters
 New Jersey, The College of: Kevin A. McHugh
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: James Catalano
 New Mexico, University of: Rudy Davalos, Robert J. Desiderio, Linda K. Estes, Richard E. Peck
 New Mexico Highlands University: Ronald W. Maestas, Joe Singleton
 New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, James T. Fisher, Albert T. Gonzales, J. Michael Orenduff
 New Orleans, University of: Sybil A. Boudreaux, Ronald J. Maestri, Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien, Karen D. Whalen
 New Paltz, State University College at: Farron Bennett, James A. Zalacca
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
 New York Institute of Technology: Clyde Doughty Jr., Indera R. Harrod
 New York University: Christopher Bledsoe

Newberry College: William Grafton Young Jr.
 Niagara University: Barbara A. Green, Michael L. Jankowski
 Nicholls State University: Deanna Falcon, Michael G. Knight
 Nichols College: Thomas R. Cafaro
 Norfolk State University: William D. Price, Delanyard L. Robinson, P. LaVerne Sweat
 North Adams State College: Scott F. Nichols
 North Alabama, University of: Sherry Kennemer, Robert L. Potts, Patricia W. Roden, K. Dan Summy
 North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Tom Cochran, Sylvia Dyer, Thomas B. Hunnicutt, Patsy B. Reed, Robert D. Yearout
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, John P. Evans, Beth Miller, John D. Swofford
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: David Goldfield, Judy W. Rose, Kimberly Green Whitestone, James H. Woodward
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: Nelson E. Bobb, Harold G. Hall III, David B. Knight, Patricia A. Sullivan
 North Carolina, University of, at Pembroke: Susan Edkins, Joseph B. Oxendine, Ray Pennington, Mitch Tyler
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: Pat Howey, Paul A. Miller, James C. Sabella
 North Carolina A&T State University: Dorothy J. Alston, Willie J. Burden, Edward B. Fort, James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, William E. Lide, Faith Shearer
 North Carolina State University: Arthur W. Cooper, David Horning, James D. Miller, Leslie G. Robinson
 North Central College: Walter J. Johnson
 North Dakota, University of: Kathleen McCann, Pete Oliszczak, DuWayne Wacker, Terry Wanless
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, Allan G. Fischer
 North Florida, University of: Richard Gropper, Adam W. Herbert, Kathleen Klein, Lucretia D. Simmons
 North Park College: Jerry Chaplin
 North Texas, University of: Roy E. Culberson, Craig Helwig, John Thornton
 Northeast Louisiana University: Walter N. "Skeet" Creekmore, Richard C. Giannini, Diane Stark, Lawson L. Swearingen Jr.
 Northeastern Illinois University: Vivian L. Fuller, Lynn Gaziano, Joseph C. Morton, Melvin C. Terrell
 Northeastern University: Irwin Cohen, Terry Condon, Barry Gallup, Richard Lapchick, Tracy Shoemake, David C. Wharton
 Northern Arizona University: Steven P. Holton, Sam F. McClanahan, Kelly Woodward
 Northern Colorado, University of: James Fallis, Robert L. Heiny, Denise O'Grady, Stormie Lynn Wells
 Northern Illinois University: Diane Abrahamson, Robert J. Brigham, Robert Collins, Raymond Dembinski, Cary Groth, John E. La Tourette
 Northern Iowa, University of: Christopher Ritrievi, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson
 Northern Kentucky University: Thomas J. Kearns, Jane Meier, Norleen K. Pomerantz

Northern Michigan University: Richard B. Comley, Leisa Rosen, James Suksi
 Northern State University: William Haigh, James Kretchman, Lisa Schriver
 Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, James C. Redd, Sherri Reeves
 Northwestern State University: Gregory S. Burke, Jerry Pierce, Randall J. Webb
 Northwestern University: Frederick Hemke, Nancy Lyons, Kelly P. Murphy, Charles F. "Rick" Taylor
 Northwood University: David W. Coffey
 Notre Dame, College of (California): John Babel, Virginia Babel
 Notre Dame, College of (Maryland): Donna M. Ledwin
 Notre Dame, University of: Rev. E. William Beauchamp, Melissa L. Conboy, Lawrence "Bubba" Cunningham, Michael Karwoski, Michael A. Wadsworth
 Oakland University: Paul E. Bissonnette, Tracy Huth, William Macauley, Jack Mehl, Gary Russi
 Occidental College: Dale V. Widolff
 Oglethorpe University: Donald S. Stanton, Philip P. Zinsmeister
 Ohio Northern University: Gale E. Daugherty
 Ohio State University: Ferdinand A. Geiger, Archie M. Griffin, Susan M. Hartmann, Jodi A. McCurdy, Lawrence M. Romanoff, Miechelle O. Willis
 Ohio University: Thomas Boeh, Robert Glidden, Judith Matthews, Todd J. Miller, Peggy J. Pruitt, Patrick S. Washburn
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Justin Kronewetter
 Oklahoma, University of: Gail Blaylock, Daniel G. Gibbens, Marita Hynes
 Oklahoma State University: Ann Baer, Robert Burton, James E. Halligan, Gerald M. Lage, Terry Don Phillips
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, James V. Koch, Janis V. Sanchez
 Old Westbury, State University College at: Ed Wolfarth
 Olivet College: Mark Bollman, Dick Kaiser, Nancy Van Hoozier
 Oneonta, State University College at: Carol Anne Blazina
 Oral Roberts University: Mike Carter, Richard L. Roberts, Terry Unruh, Revis Ward
 Oregon, University of: Gary Gray, William Moos, James M. O'Fallon, Barbara Walker
 Oregon State University: Dutch Baughman, Michael Beachley, Robert J. Frank, Paul G. Risser, Robyn Sharp
 Oswego, State University College at: Sandra L. Moore
 Otterbein College: Richard Fishbaugh
 Pace University: Ramona Polvere
 Pacific (California), University of the: Donald W. Bryan, Donald V. De Rosa, Dan Malley, Cynthia Spiro
 Paine College: Ricardo Bravo
 Pennsylvania, University of: Steve Bilsky, D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, Carolyn Schlie Femovich
 Pennsylvania State University: John A. Bove, John J. Coyle, Tim Curley,

Ellen L. Perry, Graham B. Spanier
 Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College: John N. Grode
 Pepperdine University: Andrew K. Benton, Roxanne K. Levenson, Wayne Wright
 Pfeiffer University: T. J. Kostecky
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Thomas R. Shirley Jr.
 Pittsburg State University: Charles Broyles, John R. Darling, George Graham, Shannon Schmieg
 Pittsburgh, University of: Ronald Brown, Jerome Cochran, Timothy M. Fitzpatrick, Kenneth F. Metz, Steven C. Pederson, Donna Sanft, Carol J. Sprague
 Pittsburgh, University of, at Johnstown: J. Anthony Capon
 Plattsburgh, State University of New York at: Peter Luguri, Michael Miranda
 Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford, Richard Hage, Donald P. Wharton
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Curtis W. Tong
 Portland, University of: Tony DiSpigno, Joseph A. Etzel, Rev. David T. Tyson
 Portland State University: Robert Lockwood, Anne McCoy, Jim Sterk
 Potsdam, State University College at: Bill Kaiser
 Prairie View A&M University: Angela McMorris, Stephen Wiggins
 Presbyterian College: George M. Dupuy, J. Allen Morris
 Princeton University: Amy Campbell, Nathan Smith, George H. VanderZwaag, Gary D. Walters
 Principia College: Seth C. Johnson
 Providence College: Mark Devine, Terence J. Keegan, John M. Marinatto
 Purdue University: Steven C. Beering, Morgan J. Burke, Martha O. Chiscon, Joni Comstock, Philip E. Nelson

 Queens College (New York): Allen Lee Sessoms, Richard Wettan
 Quincy University: James Naumovich, Rev. James Toal
 Quinnipiac College: Matt Bassett, John Lahey, John E. Leary, Jack McDonald, Linda J. Wooster

 Radford University: Douglas Covington, Greig Denny, Paul Harris, Charles L. Hayes, Chuck Taylor, Dawn Turner
 Ramapo College: Catherine M. Collins, Michael J. Ricciardi
 Randolph-Macon College: Jeff Burns, Helmut Werner
 Randolph-Macon Woman's College: Emily S. Ryals
 Redlands, University of: James R. Appleton, Carl R. Clapp, Christopher Walker
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith W. Burling
 Regis University (Colorado): Tom Dedin, Barbara J. Schroeder
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte, Kerry Quinn
 Rhode Island, University of: Lauren E. Anderson, Robert L. Carothers, Donald E. McCreight, Ronald J. Petro, Christian D. Pope
 Rhode Island College: Gail H. Davis, Donald E. Tencher
 Rhodes College: Mike Clary, Sarah Hargas
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Malcolm Gillis, John R. May, Steven Moniaci
 Richard Stockton College of New Jersey: G. Larry James

Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Charles S. Boone, Ruth Goehring
 Rider University: Curtis W. Blake, Chet Dalgewicz, Jonathan Husch, J. Barton Luedeke, Nancy L. Roberts
 Roanoke College: M. Scott Allison
 Robert Morris College: Bruce A. Corrie, Robert W. Norberg
 Rochester, University of: Jeffrey Vennell, Joyce Wong
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis W. Spiotti
 Roger Williams College: William M. Baird
 Rollins College: Dan O'Callaghan, J. Philip Roach
 Rosemont College: Margaret E. Trainor, Pamela Wojnar
 Rowan College of New Jersey: Joyce Reighn, Edward Streb
 Russell Sage College: Raymond C. Nause
 Rust College: David L. Beckley
 Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Francis L. Lawrence, Jeffrey I. Rubin, Rita Kay Thomas
 Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Newark: John K. Adams

 Sacred Heart University: James Barquinero, Scott Colvin, C. Donald Cook, Elizabeth Luckie
 Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr.
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Carl Ullrich
 St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas
 St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix, Patrick D. Simon
 St. Benedict, College of: Carol Howe-Veenstra, Lu Ann Reif
 St. Bonaventure University: David Diles, Barbara Hick
 St. Catherine, College of: Sheila Brown
 St. Cloud State University: Sue Becker, Arthur F. Grachek, Bruce F. Grube, Shawna L. Hutchins, Morris Kurtz
 St. Francis College (New York): James G. Thompson
 St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Bruce Elwell, Maryelizabeth Grace, Frank Pergolizzi
 St. John Fisher College: Michele Morano, Lori Szalay
 St. John's University (Minnesota): Kenneth M. Jones
 St. John's University (New York): Edward J. Manetta Jr., Kathleen Meehan
 St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Fred Berger, Linda Deno
 St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Don J. DiJulia, Stephen Porth, Rev. Nicholas S. Rashford
 St. Lawrence University: Roy C. Caldwell, John A. Clark
 St. Leo College: Ted Owens
 St. Louis University: Lori A. Flanagan, Michael J. Ross, Doug Woolard
 St. Mary's College (California): Sue Fallis, Richard Mazzuto, Betsy Reed
 St. Mary's College (Indiana): Jan Travis
 St. Mary's College of Maryland: Paul R. Moyer
 St. Mary's University of Minnesota: Linda Anderson
 St. Michael's College: Zafir Bludevich, Edward P. Markey
 St. Norbert College: Larry Van Alstine
 St. Olaf College: Lee M. Swan
 St. Paul's College: Sunday A. Adesuyi, Monique Morgan
 St. Peter's College: Kim E. Culligan, Rev. James N. Loughran, William A.

Stein

St. Rose, College of: Catherine C. Haker
St. Scholastica, College of: Kevin C. Snyder
St. Thomas, University of (Minnesota): Jo Ann Andregg
Salem State College: John D. Galaris
Salem-Teikyo University: Robert Schneider, Lou Talerico
Salisbury State University: Michael P. Vienna
Salve Regina University: John J. Rok
Sam Houston State University: Ronnie Choate, Tom Davis, Bobby K. Marks
Samford University: Stephen C. Allgood, Christopher Metress
San Diego, University of: Thomas Innacone, Mitch Malachowski, Kimberly Nowak, Dan Yourg
San Diego State University: Richard M. Bay, Jana Doggett, Ernst Griffin
San Francisco, University of: Sandee L. Hill, William J. Hogan
San Francisco State University: Elizabeth Alden, Patricia Bartscher, Rosalyn Dunlap
San Jose State University: Thomas M. Brennan, Daniel Buerger, Robert L. Caret, Carolyn M. Lewis, Charles Whitcomb
Santa Clara University: Lynda Tealer, Carroll M. Williams
Savannah College of Art and Design: Matthew T. Newman
Savannah State University: Hornsby Howell, Alicia Leverett, George N. Williams, John T. Wolfe Jr.
Scranton, University of: Jack O'Malley
Seattle Pacific University: Alan R. Graham
Seton Hall University: George P. Browne, Laurence C. Keating Jr., Sue Regan, Robert T. Sheeran, Laura A. Wankel
Shaw University: Dianthia M. Ford, Ernest L. Pickens, Rudolph A. Williams
Shepherd College: Barbara E. Beard
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, C. William Knerr, James G. Pribula
Siena College: Timothy Burke, John D'Argenio, Joyce A. Legere
Simpson College: Bruce F. Sloan
Skidmore College: Tim Brown
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, Robert N. Aebersold, Bob Heller, Philip Kennedy, Paul A. Lueken
Smith College: Lynn Oberbillig, Andrew Zimbalist
Sonoma State University: Rand Link
South, University of: Nancy Ladd, Robert W. Pearigen, Mark Webb, Samuel R. Williamson
South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried, George D. Smith, Samuel J. Strada, Hal Williams, Pamela E. Young
South Carolina, University of, at Aiken: Robert E. Alexander, James Kauffman, Douglas R. Warrick
South Carolina, University of, Columbia: Laurie Massa, Michael B. McGee, John M. Palms, Susie H. VanHuss
South Carolina, University of, at Spartanburg: H. Michael Hall, John C. Stockwell, Edwin F. Wilde
South Carolina State University: Timothy J. Autry Jr., Leroy Davis, Benjamin F. Kraft, Rita Jackson Teal
South Dakota, University of: Jack F. Doyle, George R. Horner, Mary Mock

South Dakota State University: Mylo A. Hellickson, Fred M. Oien, Robert T. Wagner
South Florida, University of: Betty Castor, Paul S. Griffin, Pamela LaPan, Barbara Sparks-McGlinchy, Curtis W. Wienker
Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping
Southeast Missouri State University: Joseph H. Low Jr., Richard A. McDuffie, Dale F. Nitzschke, Lana Richmond, Alicia Scott
Southeastern Louisiana University: Billy Bond, Sally Clausen, Tom Douple
Southern California, University of: Michael Garrett, Daryl Gross, Michael L. Jackson, Lisa L. Love, Noel Ragsdale, Fred Stroock
Southern Colorado, University of: Patrick Bottini, Les Morken, Tony Taibi
Southern Connecticut State University: Antonio L. Aceto, Michael J. Adanti, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Darryl Rogers
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale: Harold R. Bardo, Donald L. Beggs, James Hart, Charlotte West
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Nick Adams, James Buck, Cynthia Jones, John Meisel
Southern Indiana, University of: Charles J. Bertram, Steve J. Newton
Southern Maine, University of: Albert D. Bean
Southern Methodist University: Thomas E. Barry, W. James Copeland Jr., Charles Howard, C. Paul Rogers III, Barb Totzke, R. Gerald Turner
Southern Mississippi, University of: Horace W. Fleming, Ralph N. Floyd Jr., Helen Grant, Ronald G. Marquardt, H. C. "Bill" McLellan
Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem, Moses K. Dupre, Brenda L. Edmond, Thonius Robinson Jr.
Southern Utah University: Kathryn Berg, Jack Bishop, David R. Braegger, Michael Richards, Gerald R. Sherratt
Southwest Baptist University: Rex B. Brown, Stephanie Miller, Rod Oglesby, C. Pat Taylor
Southwest Missouri State University: Linda Dollar, R. Bruce Johnson, John H. Keiser, Bill O'Neill, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn
Southwest Texas State University: Michael F. Alden, Dana L. Craft, James Studer, Jerome H. Supple
Southwestern Louisiana, University of: J. Wayne Andrepont, Ray P. Authement, Nelson J. Schexnayder Jr.
Southwestern University (Texas): Sherri Babcock, Glada C. Munt, Roy B. Shilling Jr.
Springfield College: Betty L. Mann, Cathie A. Schweitzer, Craig Poisson
Stanford University: Susan Simoni Burk, Edward Leland, Cheryl L. Levick, Jerry I. Porras
Staten Island, College of: Eugene Marshall Jr.
Stephen F. Austin State University: Dan Angel, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo
Stetson University: Jeffrey P. Altier, H. Douglas Lee, Elizabeth J. Schumaker
Stony Brook, State University of New York at: Paul J. Dudzick, Eugene R. Katz, Richard F. Laskowski, Sandra R. Weeden
Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
Susquehanna University: Joel Cunningham, Connie Harnum, Donald Harnum

Swarthmore College: Robert E. Williams
 Sweet Briar College: Bonnie J. Kestner
 Syracuse University: John J. Crouthamel, Robert H. Edson, Janet Kittell, Kenneth A. Shaw, A. Dale Tussing

Tampa, University of: Hindman Wall
 Tarleton State University: Susan Burton, Lamar Johanson, Jim Johnson, Dennis P. McCabe
 Temple University: JoAnne A. Epps, Paul Gibson, David P. O'Brien
 Tennessee, University of, at Chattanooga: James T. Green, Frederick W. Obear, Lisa M. Rhodes
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Carl W. Asp, Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey, Joseph E. Johnson, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., William T. Snyder, Donna C. Thomas
 Tennessee, University of, at Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Benny Hollis, Milly MacDonell, Margaret N. Perry
 Tennessee State University: Wayne E. Bell, Gregory A. Clark, Bernard Crowell, Howard C. Gentry Jr., James A. Hefner, Thomas J. Martin, Carmelia Taylor
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, Marcia Borys, Angelo A. Volpe
 Texas, University of, at Arlington: Peter D. Carlon, Karin McCallum, Bill Reeves, Janine Smith, Dan Williams
 Texas, University of, at Austin: Robert M. Berdahl, DeLoss Dodds, Waneen Spirduso
 Texas, University of, at El Paso: Susan E. Glatter, John K. Thompson
 Texas, University of, Pan American: Gary Gallup, Miguel A. Nevarez, Linda O'Daniel
 Texas, University of, at San Antonio: Ernest DeWinne, Chris Gage, Samuel A. Kirkpatrick, Michelle Perry, Bobby Thompson
 Texas A&M University, College Station: Thomas W. Adair III, Ray M. Bowen, Wally Groff, Lynn Hickey
 Texas A&M University-Commerce: Margaret Harbison, James Randy McBroom, Jerry D. Morris
 Texas A&M University-Kingsville: Darvin R. Hoffman
 Texas Christian University: Carolyn J. Dixon, Joseph W. Helmick, Jack Hesselbrock, Frank Windegger
 Texas Southern University: Gita P. Bolt, James M. Douglas, Rick Holden, W. Sue Leffall, Harold Odom, Carol H. Parker
 Texas Tech University: Donald R. Haragan, Taylor McNeel, Gerald Myers, Robert M. Sweazy
 Texas Woman's University: Richard Nicholas, Judy Southard, Frank Vitro
 Thiel College: John A. Dickason
 Toledo, University of: Larry Gipson, James M. Klein, Peter A. Liske, Marnie W. Swift
 Towson State University: Wayne Edwards, Margaret E. Faulkner, Joanne Glasser, Nance Reed, Hoke L. Smith
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton, Robin L. Sheppard
 Trinity University (Texas): Scott T. Chapman, Julie Jenkins, Robert C. King
 Troy State University: Fred B. Davis, Jack Hawkins Jr., Allen Owen,

Douglas C. Patterson, Johnny Williams
 Truman State University: Mary Sue Beersman, Walter H. Ryle, Kathy J. Turpin
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo, John A. Di Biaggio
 Tulane University: Anne S. Barbour, Scott Devine, Eamon M. Kelly, Ian McCaw, Gary R. Roberts
 Tulsa, University of: Barry A. Kinsey, Robert W. Lawless, Judy MacLeod, Foti Mellis
 Tuskegee University: William L. Lester

U.S. Air Force Academy: Denise Cohen, Brad Hebing, Col. Hans J. Muen, Col. Randall W. Spetman
 U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Raymond Cieplik
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Susan Petersen Lubow
 U.S. Military Academy: Lt. Gen. Daniel W. Christman, Col. Daniel M. Litynski, Bill Schutsky, Albert Vanderbush
 U.S. Naval Academy: Thomas Bates, Jack Lengyel, Richard D. Mathieu
 Union College (New York): Richard S. Sakala
 Upper Iowa University: Rick Klann, Paul Rudolph
 Ursinus College: William E. Akin, Adele P. Boyd, Barry N. Bowers
 Utah, University of: Larry R. Gerlach, Amy E. Hackett, Christopher P. Hill, Arthur K. Smith
 Utah State University: Charles Bell, Mary Ellen Cloninger, George H. Emert, Michael Parent
 Utica College: James A. Spartano

Valdosta State University: Hugh C. Bailey, Herb Reinhard, Charles R. Tucker
 Valparaiso University: Bruce G. Berner, Alan F. Harre, Nona Richardson, William L. Steinbrecher
 Vanderbilt University: Thomas G. Burish, C. Jeffrey Compher, June Stewart, William T. "Todd" Turner, Joe B. Wyatt
 Vassar College: Valerie Cushman, Andrew M. Jennings
 Vermont, University of: Dean M. Batt, Richard A. Farnham, Sally Guerette, Robert B. Lawson, Jeff Schulman, Anne M. Sullivan
 Villanova University: Gene DeFilippo, Mary Anne Dowling, Daniel T. Regan, John A. Robinson Jr.
 Virginia, University of: M. Terry Holland, Craig Littlepage, Jane Miller, Lynn M. Mitchell, D. Alan Williams
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Richard L. Sander, Wendy Taylor
 Virginia Military Institute: Davis Babb, Col. Thomas W. Davis, Joseph C. Smith
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: David T. Braine, Derek Carter, Larry N. Killough, Sharon L. McCloskey
 Virginia State University: Claud Flythe, Alfreeda Goff
 Virginia Union University: James F. Battle, Jacqueline McWilliams
 Virginia Wesleyan College: Donald M. Forsyth

Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke, David A. Phillips
 Wagner College: Walter C. Hameline, William Smith
 Wake Forest University: Dianne Dailey, Craig Keilitz, Ron Wellman, Edwin G. Wilson

Wartburg College: Gary Grace
 Washburn University of Topeka: Larry D. Blumberg, Janet M. Degginger, Loren Ferre, Hugh L. Thompson
 Washington, University of: Robert H. Aronson, Ralph Bayard, Barbara A. Hedges, Marie T. Tuite
 Washington and Jefferson College: John J. Gregor
 Washington and Lee University: Cinda L. Rankin, Michael F. Walsh
 Washington College (Maryland): Penny J. Fall, Bryan Matthews, John S. Toll
 Washington State University: Rick Dickson, Dan C. Peterson, Marcia L. Saneholtz, Samuel H. Smith, Irving Tallman
 Washington University (Missouri): Philip Godfrey, Lynn S. Imergoot, John M. Schael
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Peter Chapman, Donald Mash
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Bob V. Brennan, John D. Petersen, Christ Petrouleas
 Waynesburg College: Dan Baranik
 Weber State University: Gordon E. "Dutch" Belnap, Michael Norman, Paul H. Thompson
 Webster University: Thomas Hart
 Wellesley College: Louise O'Neal
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad
 Wesley College: Steve D. Clark
 Wesleyan University (Connecticut): John S. Biddiscombe, Gale Lackey
 West Alabama, University of: Donald C. Hines, Dee Outlaw, Louis R. Smith Jr.
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Deborah Anekstein, Edward M. Matejkovic, Paul M. Oliaro
 West Florida, University of: Richard Berg
 West Georgia, State University of: J. Blake Lanier
 West Liberty State College: David C. Brooks, James W. Watson, Ronald M. Zaccari
 West Texas A&M University: Ed Harris, Hellon K. Wilbur
 West Virginia University: Forest J. Bowman, Ed Pastilong
 West Virginia University Institute of Technology: Joseph S. Blauser, John P. Carrier
 West Virginia Wesleyan College: William R. Haden, George A. Klebez
 Western Carolina University: John W. Bardo, Fred Cantler, Marcy Girtan, Scott Higgins, Larry L. Travis
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington
 Western Illinois University: William E. Johnson, Larry Mortier, Kathy Orban, Helen Smiley
 Western Kentucky University: Pam Herriford, Thomas C. Meredith, Lewis B. Mills, Steven D. White
 Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter Jr.
 Western Michigan University: Kathy B. Beauregard, Adrian "Ed" Edwards, John Friedl, James C. Weaver
 Western New Mexico University: Scott Woodard
 Western State College of Colorado: Leila M. Calkins
 Westfield State College: Edwin Abar, Nancy Bals, Kenneth Magarian
 Westminster College (Missouri): Terry Logue
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd, John K. Lloyd

Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Gina Loudenburg, Chad Yowell
 Wheeling Jesuit College: Carole T. Coleman
 Whittier College: Charles S. Adams, David A. Jacobs
 Wichita State University: Darlene Bailey, Bill Belknap, Eugene M. Hughes, Martin M. Perline
 Widener University: John E. Douglas
 Wilkes University: Addy Malatesta
 William and Mary, College of: David J. Aday, Barbara Blosser, Terry Driscoll
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant
 William Penn College: Michael Laird
 Williams College: Lisa Melendy
 Wilmington College (Ohio): Terry A. Rupert
 Wingate University: Beth Lawrence, Jerry E. McGee
 Winona State University: Gary Evans, Larry Holstad
 Winston-Salem State University: Arnold Lockett, Albert L. Roseboro, Alvin J. Schexnider
 Winthrop University: Jill Deese, Anthony J. DiGiorgio, Thomas N. Hickman, Evelyne Weeks
 Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Marilyn Skrivseth
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Otis Chambers, Charles A. Ihrke
 Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse: Carol Bassuener, Bridget Belgiovine, Judith L. Kuipers
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Anthony Adams, James L. Hoyt, Cheryl A. Marra, Michael A. Moss, Pat Richter
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Rita Hartung Cheng, Deanna D'Abbraccio, Bud K. Haidet, William W. Mayrl
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Allen F. Ackerman, Sandra Gade, John E. Kerrigan
 Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Lenny Klaver, Eleanor J. Smith
 Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: John Krogman, David J. Markee, Mark Molesworth, Lisa A. Riedle
 Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Connie Foster, Dean Henderson
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Frank O'Brien, Virgil A. Thiesfeld
 Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Steven P. Terry
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Dianne Jones
 Wittenberg University: Jeff A. Ankrom, Carl F. Schraibman
 Wofford College: Thad Lepcio, Joab M. Lesesne Jr., Terri Lewitt, Ted R. Monroe, Daniel S. Wood
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, Robert Malekoff, Brenda L. Meese
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond R. Gilbert
 Worcester State College: Susan E. Chapman
 Wright State University: Dan Abrahamowicz, Michael J. Cusack, Charles J. Hartmann, Paul Newman, Peggy L. Wynkoop
 Wyoming, University of: David Baker, Sterling R. Brown, Janet C. Constantinides, Terri Howes, Lee Moon

Xavier University (Ohio): Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Ginger Fulton, Janice B. Walker

Yale University: Barbara N. Chesler, Colleen Lim

Yeshiva University: Stephen B. Young
Youngstown State University: Frederick J. Blue, Leslie H. Cochran,
Pauline N. Saternow, James P. Tressel

Conference Members

America East: Stuart P. Haskell Jr., Julie Power
Atlantic Coast Conference: Rick Chryst, Eugene F. Corrigan, Thomas P. Mickle, David V. Thompson, DeLores S. Todd
Atlantic 10 Conference: Linda M. Bruno, Cindy Mazda
Big East Conference: Kate Hickey, Tom McElroy, Michael A. Tranghese, Stan Wilcox
Big Sky Conference: Douglas B. Fullerton, Kathy Noble
Big South Conference: Jon M. Fagg, Kyle B. Kallander
Big Ten Conference: James E. Delany, Phyllis L. Howlett, Carol Iwaoka
Big 12 Conference: Britton Banowsky, Donnie Duncan, Lori A. Ebihara, Prentice Gautt, Dru Hancock, Steven J. Hatchell
Big West Conference: Dennis A. Farrell, Robert L. Halvaks, Paula Y. Smith
California Collegiate Athletic Association: Tom D. Morgan
Capital Athletic Conference: Richard C. Cook
Carolinas-Virginia Athletic Conference: Alan H. Patterson
Centennial Conference: Megan C. Patruno, Steven F. Ulrich
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Patrick Carter, Leon G. Kerry
City University of New York Athletic Conference: Ted Hurwitz, Zak Iukovic
College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Jack Swartz
*Collegiate Water Polo Association: Daniel Sharadin
Colonial Athletic Association: Kathleen Hallock, Thomas E. Yeager
Commonwealth Coast Conference: Steve Washkevich
Conference USA: Sandra Biller, Jim Campbell, Noreen Morris, Michael L. Slive, Brenda R. Weare
Constitution Athletic Conference: Richard A. Hill
Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Michael J. Welch
Eastern College Athletic Conference: Clayton W. Chapman, Dan Ghormley, Mary Lou Thimas
*Gateway Football Conference: Patricia Viverito
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas J. Brown
Great Lakes Valley Conference: Carl McAloose
Great Northeast Athletic Conference: Joanne Merrill
Gulf South Conference: Nathan N. Salant
Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph B. McBride
Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: John Van Why
Ivy Group: Carolyn Campbell, Jeffrey H. Orleans
Little East Conference: Albert D. Bean Jr.
Lone Star Conference: Fred Jacoby
Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: John D. Galaris
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Barbara Church, Richard J. Ensor, Kathleen Heitzman, Karin Torchia
Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Sheila K. Wallace Kovalchik

Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones
Mid-American Conference: Rob Fournier, Jerry A. Ippoliti
Mid-Continent Conference: Cindy A. Harris, Jon A. Steinbrecher
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Charles S. Harris, Brenda H. McCoy, James Rod Wyatt
Middle Atlantic States Conference: Linda E. Hopple
Midwest Conference: Ruth E. Peterson
Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Amy Frankenstein, Jonathan B. LeCrone
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Carlyle Carter
Missouri Valley Conference: J. Douglas Elgin
New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Moore
New England Women's Eight: Louise O'Neal
New Jersey Athletic Conference: Joy L. Reighn
New York Collegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas Gallagher
New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Terry Wansart
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Melanie Heitman Nelson, Noel W. Olson
North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis F. Butler, Dennis M. Collins, Brian Sullivan
Northeast Conference: J. Stevens Hurlbut, Chris Monasch
Northeast-10 Conference: F. Paul Bogan
Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference: Thomas Wistrill
Ohio Athletic Conference: Timothy W. Gleason
Ohio Valley Conference: R. Daniel Beebe, Ronald J. English
Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Brad Bankston
Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Christine W. Hoyles, Mike Matthews, David Price
*Pacific West Conference: Elwood B. Hahn
Patriot League: Constance H. Hurlbut, Tim Parker
Peach Belt Athletic Conference: Marvin Vanover
Pennsylvania Athletic Conference: Shirley Liddle
Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Charles A. "Tod" Eberle
Presidents' Athletic Conference: Dan Baranik
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: Kurt Patberg
Saint Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Geraldine Albins
Skyline Conference: James Catalano
South Atlantic Conference: Doug Echols, Matt Lawton
Southeastern Conference: Stacy L. Danley, Beth DeBauche, Damon Evans, Roy Kramer, James L. McCullough, Mark Womack
Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Rick Simon
Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference: Stephen P. Argo
Southern Conference: Sue Arakas, Gil Grimes, Charles H. Lyle, Wright Waters
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Wallace Jackson, Toney Means
Southland Conference: Beth Ammons, Sue Donohoe, Gregory Sankey
Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank, LaRita Greer
State University of New York Athletic Conference: Patrick R. Damore
Sun Belt Conference: Robert J. Bernardi, John Iamarino, Craig Thompson

Sunshine State Conference: Don Landry
 Trans America Athletic Conference: William C. Bibb, Sherri Booker,
 Edward Gumbart, Stephen E. Sturek Jr.
 University Athletic Association: Richard A. Rasmussen
 Upstate Collegiate Athletic Conference: Tim Brown
 West Coast Conference: Michael M. Gilleran, Teresa Kuehn, Don Ott
 West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Barry Blizzard
 Western Athletic Conference: Karl D. Benson, Margie H. McDonald, Dell
 Robinson
 *Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Bruce M. McLeod
 Wisconsin State University Conference: Gary F. Karner
 Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judith
 Kruckman
 *Nonvoting

Provisional Members

Anderson College (South Carolina): Bobby Beville, Ellen King
 Arkansas, University of, Monticello: Mary Jane Gilbert, Fred J. Taylor
 Arkansas, University of, Pine Bluff: H. O. Clemmons, Lawrence A. Davis
 Jr., Vannette W. Johnson
 Arkansas Tech University: Dean Lee
 Austin College: Robert T. Mason, David Norman, Jack Pierce
 Belmont University: Maury Wayne Curry, Ken Sidwell, Michael
 Strickland, William E. Troutt, Betty Wiseman
 Brigham Young University, Hawaii: E. LeRoy Overstreet
 Brooklyn College: Vivian Acosta, Bruce Filosa, Vernon E. Lattin
 Cazenovia College: Marvin Christopher
 Centenary College (New Jersey): Stephanie Bennett-Smith, Patrick J.
 Zipfel
 Central Washington University: Keith Michael Champagne, Gary C.
 Frederick
 Chatham College: Noreen O'Malley
 Chowan College: James G. Garrison, Becky McLawhorn
 Christian Brothers University: Doreen M. Powell
 Clarke College: Dan Corken
 Clayton College and State University: Mason Barfield, Richard A.
 Skinner
 Columbia Union College: Richard Murray
 Concordia University (Wisconsin): James Juergensen, Kenneth L. Witte
 Dallas, University of: Monsignor Milam Joseph, Richard L. Strockbine,
 Fred Zuker
 East Central University: Bill S. Cole, Tim Green, Troy Ray Hamlett
 East Texas Baptist University: Gary K. Cain
 Eastern Oregon State College: Peggy Anderson
 Evergreen State College: Janette Parent, Pete Steilberg
 George Fox University: Craig Taylor
 Georgia Southwestern College: Steve R. Cobb
 Greenville College: Jack D. Trager
 Harding University: Ted Altman, David B. Burks
 Hawaii Pacific University: Neil Morfitt
 Hilbert College: Brian Ackley

Incarnate Word College: Howard Patterson, Tina Patterson
 Johnson and Wales University: Ronald J. Bachman, Karen Fontes, David
 Morris
 La Roche College: Jim Tinkey
 Lake Erie College: Robert C. Benz
 Lassell College: Kristy Walter
 Lesley College: Paula D. O'Gilvie
 Lewis and Clark College: Greg Fredricks, Judy McMullen, Steve Wallo
 Lewis-Clark State College: Gary Picone
 Linfield College: Scott Carnahan, Steve Simmons
 Lyon College: Terry J. Garner
 Maine, University of, Farmington: Leonard R. MacPhee
 Maranatha Baptist Bible College: Greg Weniger
 Marian College (Wisconsin): Brian Gillogly, Ron Herr
 Mary Hardin-Baylor, University of: Darla Kirby, Ben Shipp
 Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences: Donna
 M. Ruseckas
 McMurry University: Robert E. Shimp
 Midwestern State University: Stephen A. Holland, Louis J. Rodriquez,
 Rick Williams
 Montevallo, University of: Robert M. McChesney, Bob Riesener
 Mount St. Joseph, College of: Ron Corradini
 New England, University of: Dennis Leighton, Karol L'Heureux
 Northeastern State University: Gil Cloud, Matt Cochran, Louis F. White
 Oklahoma Panhandle State University: Danny Stone, Kathleen Turner
 Ouachita Baptist University: Jesse "Buddy" Benson
 Ozarks, University of the (Arkansas): Buddy Lee Smith, Gene
 Stephenson
 Pacific Lutheran University: Paul Hoseth
 Pacific University (Oregon): Judy Sherman
 Pittsburgh, University of, at Bradford: Daniel N. Audette
 Puerto Rico, University of, Bayamon: Luis Roberto Reeves, Ariel
 Rodriguez, Jorge L. Rosario
 Puerto Rico, University of, Mayaguez: W. Minor Carter, Manuel D.
 Ramirez, Stuart J. Ramos, William Rodriguez
 Puget Sound, University of: William E. Dasher, Richard Ulrich
 Rivier College: Joanne Merrill
 Rockhurst College: Frank Diskin
 St. Edward's University: John Knorr, Debora Williamson
 St. Joseph's College (New York): Donald L. Lizak
 St. Martin's College: Clayton N. Smith
 St. Mary's University (Texas): Charlie Migl, Rev. John Moder, Ruth R.
 Rodgers
 Schreiner College: J. Thompson Biggers
 Southeastern Oklahoma State University: Donald A. Parham, Larry
 Williams
 Southern Arkansas University: Jay Adcox, Steven G. Gamble, W. T.
 Watson
 Southern Vermont College: Brian Fruscio
 Southwestern Oklahoma State University: Joe Anna Hibler, Kelli Litsch,
 Cecil Perkins
 Stephens College: Marcia Kierscht

Sul Ross State University: R. Vic Morgan
 Texas Lutheran College: Kathryn Yandell
 Texas Wesleyan University: Rosemarie Stallman
 Trinity College (District of Columbia): Candice C. Poiss
 Tusculum College: Jim Fields
 Virgin Islands, University of the: Laura T. Daniel, Jim Hatfield, Frank L. Heikkiln
 West Virginia State College: Bryce Casto
 Western Oregon State College: R. John Brinegar, Jon Carey
 Western Washington University: Lynda Goodrich
 Westminster College (Pennsylvania): Joseph B. Fusco
 Wheelock College: Edward J. Matz
 Whitman College: Max Seachris
 Whitworth College: Scott McQuilkin, Richard E. Schatz
 Willamette University: David E. Goodney, Jerry E. Hudson, William G. Trenbeath
 Wilson College: Lori A. Frey
 Wisconsin Lutheran College: Paul F. Knueppel

Affiliated Members

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers: Cliff Gillespie
 American Baseball Coaches Association: David B. Keilitz, Bob Warn
 Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic: Jake O'Donnell, William C. Sullivan
 College Football Association: Charles M. Neinas
 College Gymnastics Association: Richard Aronson, Ron Galimore, Roy Johnson, Kathy Scanlan, Fred Turoff
 College Swimming Coaches Association of America, Inc.: G. Robert Boettner
 Community College League of California: Joanne A. Fortunato
 Division I-A Athletics Directors Association: Gene E. Hooks
 Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: John J. Powers
 National Association for Girls and Women in Sport: Diana Everett
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Dennis M. Coleman, James Haney
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Patrick Manak
 National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators: Jennifer Alley, Erin McDermott
 National Athletic Trainers' Association: Terry O'Brien
 National Fastpitch Coaches Association: Lacy Lee Baker
 U.S. Olympic Committee: Curt L. Hamakawa, Patrice Milkovich
 Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes
 Women's Basketball Hall of Fame, Inc.: Phyllis I. Holmes

Corresponding Members

Apprentice School, The: William G. Casto
 Northwest Conference of Independent Colleges: Arleigh Dodson
 Nova Southeastern University: Mark Cavanaugh, Corey B. Johnson

Pennsylvania State University-Altoona: Fredina Ingold, Allen C. Meadors
 Pratt Institute: Michael Rogan

Visitors

Ambassador University: Gilbert Norman
 Bond, Schoeneck & King: Richard J. Evrard, Kathy Jones
 Executive Sports: Lori A. McQueen
 Fair Test: Charles Rooney, Robert A. Schaeffer
 Game Day Sports Network, Inc.: Mike Henry, Joe Tippens, Clyde Walker
 Good Sports, Inc.: Valerie M. Bonnette
 Harris, R. Mark
 Harsh, Emily H.
 Hinshaw and Culbertson: Jerome R. Vainisi
 Horton, Stephen J.
 Husson College: Pam Hennessey
 Kaplan Educational Centers: Robin Weiner
 Lamar Daniel, Inc.: Lamar Daniel
 Learfield Sports: Greg Brown, Roger Gardner
 Long, Aldridge & Norman: Evan Appel
 Louisiana System, University of: Carroll J. Falcon
 Meadowlands Sports Complex: Michael Graime, Kevin N. Kovalycsik
 Molton, Allen & Williams: Phil Boggio, William M. Jacka
 Narol, Melvin S.
 National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities: David L. Warren
 National Federation of State High School Associations: Helen E. Upton
 NCAA Foundation: David R. Gavitt
 NCAA Presidents Commission: Asa N. Green
 Princeton Review Foundation: Jay Rosner
 Rose Bowl: Bob Cheney, Harriman L. Cronk, Phyllis M. Cronk, Gary Dorn, Nancy Dorn, Mary Lou Griest, W. H. "Bud" Griest, Gary K. Hayward, Scott Jenkins, Pat Kunz, Dick Ratliff, Linda Ward, Mike Ward, Don J. Wilson
 Shreveport Regional Sports Authority: Andy Rosenbaum
 Simon Fraser University: Michael Dinning
 Smith Consulting Services: R. Dale Smith
 Southern Oregon State College: Monty Cartwright
 Taylor University: Don Taylor
 USAir: Dave Hart Sr.
 USA Noel Levitz: Glen Korobov
 Walt Disney World Sports: John A. Bisignano Jr., Brooks Johnson, Jeff Surgeon

Working News Media

ABC Sports: John Litmer
 Amusement Business: Tom Powell
 Associated Press: Mark Humphrey, Richard Rosenblatt, Doug Tucker, Teresa Walker
 Atlanta Journal-Constitution: Furman Bisher, Mike Fish

Baton Rouge Advocate: Dave Moorman
 Boston Globe: Mark Blaudschun
 CBS Sports: Michael Aresco, Raymond Harmon
 Charlotte Observer: Liz Chandler
 Chicago Tribune: Bonnie DeSimone
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Jim Naughton
 Cincinnati Enquirer: Mike DeCourcy
 CNN/SI: Paul Crane, Dave Heaberlin
 College Football Hall of Fame: Pat Harmon
 Columbus Dispatch: Bob Baptist
 Creative Sports: Pete Derzis, Charles Gerber, Loren Matthews, Arnie Sgalio
 Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell
 Des Moines Register: Tim Witosky
 Detroit Free Press: Jeff Taylor
 Detroit News: Fred Girard
 ESPN: Dave Brown, Len DeLuca, Dan Margulis, Steve Risser
 ESPN Magazine: Chris Raymond
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Wendell Barnhouse
 Hickman Voice: Don Bryant
 Huntsville Times: John Pruett
 Kansas City Star: Karen Dillon, Mike McGraw, Steve Rock, Rich Sugg
 Los Angeles Times: Lisa Dillman, Bill Dwyre
 Metro Times: Wendy Benson, Stacy Mickles
 Mobile Register: Tommy Hicks
 Nashville Banner: Joe Biddle, Kevin Spain
 Nashville Tennessean: David Climer, Mike Organ, Rex Perry, Tom Wood
 New York Times: Malcolm Moran
 Newsday: Ivan Maisel
 Raycom Sports Inc.: George Johnson, Chuck Steedman
 Scripps Howard News Service: Thomas O'Toole
 Sports Illustrated: Don Yaeger
 SportSouth: Bill Irish
 Syndicated Sports Columnist: Jimmie McDowell
 Tennessee Radio Network: Gina Logue
 Touchdown Publications: Robert Fulton
 Turner Sports: David Maggard, John Vandergrift
 USA Today: Steve Wieberg
 Washington Post: Dave Nakamura
 WSMV-TV: Aaron Solomon, Kaycie William

91st Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 12, 1997

The 91st annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 4:45 p.m., with President Eugene F. Corrigan presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Corrigan: It is a pleasure to welcome you to the opening session of this 1997 Convention. I will be with you to chair the general sessions throughout the Convention. Our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. We are assisted in that regard by our parliamentarian, Paul Engelmann of Central Missouri State University. I know we are used to seeing Alan Chapman of Rice University on the dais serving as parliamentarian. However, due to a heavy schedule at Rice, Alan is not able to be with us this year. We certainly will miss him and recognize his many contributions, but we are looking forward to working with Paul. I would also like to introduce Phyllis Howlett, with the Big Ten Conference, who serves as our secretary-treasurer of this Association. She has done an absolutely fabulous job, Phyllis Howlett. (Applause)

Also, I would like to introduce the staff member who has been very critical in his service to this Association, Steve Morgan, the chief of staff for Division I. (Applause)

One procedure that we must dispense with is the need to adopt the Convention Program before beginning our business. Before I ask for a motion to adopt the program of the Convention, I would like to point out a correction in Appendix B of the Official Notice on Page 243. Please note that I-8 of the Official Notice has been removed from Appendix B. You can cross that out.

I will now ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so that we may proceed with our work.

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I move we adopt the printed program of this Convention.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Richard A. Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Yesterday, the Division III Steering Committee voted to divide the question on Proposal No. 72. I would like to move the reordering of Proposal No. 72-B ahead of 72-A.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move to reorder Proposal 24 before Proposal 19.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move that Proposal No. 150 be reordered

to be considered before Proposal No. 71 in the Division II business session.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Constance H. Hurlbut (Patriot League): On behalf of the Council, I move to reorder Proposal No. 7 after Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

Kenneth A. Shaw (Syracuse University): I am speaking for the Presidents Commission. In our separate divisions and to a person, we oppose the reordering of No. 7 behind No. 50.

We believe as the Presidents Commission and agreed in our separate divisional groups that it is time to move on with restructuring. We don't think there is anything on tomorrow's agenda that should cause people to wonder whether they are voting for or against restructuring. I speak in opposition to this reordering.

David G. Carter (Eastern Connecticut State University): I am chair of the Division III Presidents Commission subcommittee. I speak in opposition to this change of order. We also believe that the time has come to move forward. Last year, a number of us spent many, many hours working hard to decide overwhelmingly that we wanted to move restructuring forward. Now is not the time to go through all of the changes that are being proposed and then at the end of the agenda say "nay". It doesn't make sense. The house is under construction. We are preparing to move into this new home. I urge everyone to vote against the proposed change.

Claire Van Ummersen (Cleveland State University): I support the reordering of the proposal. It makes sense, in our opinion, for the membership to consider Proposal 7 after consideration of the other significant restructuring legislation. If that legislation passes in unchanged form, there would be no need to vote on Proposal No. 7 and it could be withdrawn. Thank you.

[The motion to reorder Proposal No. 7 was defeated.]

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move that Proposal No. 34 be reordered before No. 28.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Ms. Hurlbut: On behalf of the Council, I move to reorder Proposal No. 42 ahead of No. 17.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Timothy W. Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move that Proposal No. 77 be moved in front of Proposal No. 76.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Irving Tallman (Washington State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move to reorder Proposal 63 in front of Proposal 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

William E. Kirwan (University of Maryland, College Park): With the original ordering of 62, 63 and 64, as presented in the program, careful consideration was given to allowing the more restrictive proposal to come first. This morning, the Presidents Commission understood there may be a move to reorder and reconsider this matter. It unanimously endorsed the original ordering of these proposals. On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge the defeat of this proposal.

Noel Ragsdale (University of Southern California): What is the rationale for the Presidents Commission position?

Mr. Kirwan: The presidents felt it was important to start with the most restrictive proposal and work towards the less restrictive proposals in that order.

[The motion to reorder Proposal No. 63 was defeated.]

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move the reordering of Proposal 106 to be considered after Proposal 140, which will make it the last legislation presented at the Division II business session.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Corrigan: Robert's Rules of Order provide that the procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your Convention Official Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendices listing information that may be of assistance to you. The Convention Program contains up-to-date meeting schedules and revisions of the legislation in the Official Notice.

Having told you that, we now need to pass the agenda. I will accept a motion to pass the agenda.

Mr. Hansen: I so move.

[The motion was seconded and the Convention Program was adopted as reordered.]

President Corrigan: The NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, eliminate any questions of impropriety and expedite your work as delegates. I will not take time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that this year, as always, the chairs of the various sessions fully intend to apply these procedures throughout the business of the Convention. There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently. First, in all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. Although the delegates have a right to ask for it, I will ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue. Secondly, if a delegate intends to debate an issue in any business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations and prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded, or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks. The microphone numbers will be utilized to recognize speakers. If the chair sees no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible. Third, on issues in the general business session on which we vote by division, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The result of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted. Four, please remember that NCAA procedures require all votes to be taken by paddle or roll call, when indicated, not by voice or a show of hands. You do need to have your voting paddle and your wireless voting unit with you. The electronic voting procedures will be reviewed when the first electronic vote is taken at each of the sessions. The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in the Official Notice of the Convention. I will not repeat them here. I would ask that you identify yourselves by name and affiliation whenever you address the Convention. Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak, those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate other than as observers. We have a court reporter recording the busi-

ness of our Convention, Mr. John Bowen of Kansas City. John is working his 23rd annual Convention. Give him a hand. (Applause)

Anyone wishing to withdraw a proposal should notify the staff in the Richmond Room in advance of the business sessions, if possible. Just call or stop by and tell the staff of your intention to withdraw. I would like to mention a few special features of this year's Convention. This is the fifth year for the Presidential Agenda Day, on which we devote our attention to legislation identified by the Presidents Commission as representing major policy issues of significant interest to chief executive officers. You will note that tomorrow, which is designated as Presidential Agenda Day, we will open with a general business session at 8 a.m., which will allow us to vote on the nonfederated provisions of the membership structure legislation. We then will move to the division business sessions, where we will act on the federated legislation scheduled to be voted on on Presidential Agenda Day. We will end tomorrow's business with a general session, which is scheduled from 4 to 5:30 p.m. During that session, we will vote on the remaining general legislation scheduled to be voted on during Presidential Agenda Day. Division business sessions will reconvene Tuesday at 8 a.m. and the general session will resume Tuesday at 1:30 p.m. If we need a general business session on Wednesday, we have set aside time to do that.

The other major feature of the Convention is the honors dinner tonight. Your attendance is certainly encouraged for this outstanding annual event as we honor student-athletes and past student-athletes. Let me note that the NCAA Council determined a few years ago that it would be desirable to take morning and afternoon breaks during the business sessions that are scheduled for the entire morning or afternoon. That is now a mandate of the Council. This process, as those of you who have participated before know, can be something of a marathon. We need to take a break just as much as the delegates do, and we will do so.

Let me also review briefly the "window of reconsideration" opportunity. It is a bit complicated. In the general business sessions, both Monday and Tuesday afternoon, I will call for motions to reconsider anything adopted by the division business sessions. That will be the only time that a division decision from a separate session can be reconsidered in the general business session. All reconsideration motions involving actions in the division business sessions must occur either in those division sessions or in that "window of reconsideration" pertaining to those sessions. Please note that no proposal identified for action on Presidential Agenda Day can be reconsidered the following day.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

President Corrigan: It is now my privilege to introduce the Convention committees and the chair of each. The Voting Committee is chaired by Larry Gerlach of the University of Utah. The Committee on Credentials is chaired by Joe Etzel of the University of Portland. The Memorial Resolutions Committee is chaired by Barbara Hick of St. Bonaventure University. (Applause)

In accordance with our procedures, reports of the sports committees and general committees are not presented at this Convention. They are included in NCAA Annual Reports. You can get a copy of those reports at the registration desk. There is one available for each member institution and member conference. The report of the secretary-treasurer and the report of the

Executive Committee also appear in Annual Reports. At the beginning of the general business session Tuesday afternoon, we will entertain motions to receive and approve those reports. All official actions taken during the year by the Executive Committee have appeared in The NCAA News.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

We now move to the NCAA Council Report for 1996. To present that report, I am pleased to introduce a Council member who also recently served as the Division III vice-president. He is a member of the Division III Task Force to Review the Membership Structure and has been instrumental in working through both Division III and Association-wide issues. He has done a great job for this Association, Ed Coll, president of Alfred University. (Applause)

Edward G. Coll Jr. (Alfred University): President Corrigan and members of the Association, I am honored to present to this Convention the Council report for 1996. This report is mandated by the NCAA constitution; it is thus essentially routine. This report gives the membership the opportunity to challenge any of the Council's actions during this past year. This presentation is a brief summary of those actions. As is customary, this report incorporates by reference the four reports of all Council actions during the year. That reference includes the following:

First, The NCAA News publishes minutes of each Council meeting, thus informing you in a timely fashion of all Council actions. In 1996, these minutes appeared in the following issues of The NCAA News: November 4, July 1 and April 1, 1996, and January 6, 1997. Second, the publication titled NCAA Annual Reports contains abridged minutes of this past year's Council meetings through August. That book is distributed at the Convention and mailed to each NCAA member. In those two publications, you will find every Council action of this past year. When the last general business session of this Convention begins, there will be a motion to accept and approve the Council's full report. That will be your opportunity to challenge any of these actions.

The next procedural aspect to this report is to call to your attention certain legislative actions taken by the Council. We do this by referring to three appendices in the Official Notice. Appendix B sets forth the interpretations that the Legislative Review Committee intends to include in the next printing of the NCAA Manual. All of these inclusions have been approved by the Council. At the beginning of Appendix B is the procedure for accepting or challenging the inclusion of any of these interpretations in the Manual. If you do not want any of these included in the Manual, now is the time to object. Appendix C contains noncontroversial amendments that the Council adopted during 1996. The Council has the authority to take these noncontroversial actions between Conventions. Acceptance of or a challenge to any of these actions occurs at this point. Does any delegate wish to object to any of the actions in Appendix C? Seeing no objection, we will proceed. Finally, Appendix D contains instances in which the Council modified wording in the Manual based on a review of the original intent of the legislation. Does any delegate object to any of these actions? Seeing none, that concludes the procedural features of this report.

As I am sure you may suspect, much of the Council's time over the past year was spent reviewing and discussing several issues related to the details of the Association's new governance structure, which was adopted at last year's Convention and is scheduled to be implemented this August. We con-

tinue to receive and act on reports from the transition oversight committee headed by Joe Crowley. Each of the division's transition groups that has been working on the governance structure for that division also made reports to the division steering committees for the Council. It is obvious that a great deal of time and effort has gone into the "fine tuning" of each division's governance structure, as well as the continued development of the governance structure for the Association as a whole. I hope that we all can see the benefits that this new structure will provide to each division by providing all three divisions increased autonomy. At the same time, I believe it is important to understand that this new structure also allows us to maintain a strong association with all three divisions working closely together on issues of common interest.

The Council received and acted upon the report of the Special Committee to Review Agents and Amateurism, chaired by Chancellor Brit Kirwan of the University of Maryland. This special committee has had to deal with, and will continue to deal with, a number of difficult issues related to sports agents and amateurism in general. Some of its recommendations have resulted in legislative proposals for this year's Convention. I have been impressed with the amount of time and effort that has gone into the work of this special committee, and applaud the committee for its efforts and wish it luck as it continues to deal with these very difficult issues.

The Council also received a number of recommendations from the Legislative Review Committee for deregulation and simplification of Bylaw 17, Playing and Practice Seasons. Many of these are represented by legislative proposals before you at this year's Convention. We also spent a significant amount of time considering initial-eligibility appeals. Many of these cases were challenging and difficult to resolve, and it appears that this is but one example of the many issues that will benefit from the Association's new federated, streamlined governance structure. Of course, much of the Council's time each year is spent on interpretations, legislation, membership petitions and waivers, various committee reports, and other types of activities necessary for the effective oversight and management of the Association's affairs between Conventions. These matters are reflected in the NCAA Annual Reports.

Finally, on a personal note, I would like to say what an honor and privilege it has been for me to serve on the Presidents Commission and for four years on the Council. It has been a lively and exciting and somewhat exhausting nine years. I appreciate the attention that has been focused on the activities of both the Commission and the Council. Thank you very much for the opportunity to have been of service to you. (Applause)

REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

President Corrigan: Thank you very much, Ed.

At this point in the agenda, we will have the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I ask the delegates, visitors and our friends in the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions. Now, may I present Barbara Hick of St. Bonaventure University, chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

Barbara Hick (St. Bonaventure University): President Corrigan and delegates, at this time I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. They are Connie Foster, University of Wisconsin, River Falls; and Jo Spearman, Mississippi University for Women.

The following is a listing of those men and women who have passed away since we last met:

Administrators:

Pokey Allen, Boise State
 Tracy Borah, Western State of Colorado
 Bob Brodhead, Louisiana State
 James Brooks, Texas-Pan American
 Ben Brown, Cal State Fullerton
 Donald Canfield, St. Olaf
 Robert Cullen, Cornell
 Wilson Dietrich, Memphis
 Ken Doherty, Pennsylvania
 Theardis Dunston, North Carolina State
 Fred Durdle, Dayton
 Mary Ann Edge, Millsaps
 Carmen Falcone, Duke
 Ken Farris Sr., Oklahoma
 Gene Fetter, Arizona
 William Francis, M.D., Tennessee Tech
 Doc Gimmler, St. John's (New York)
 P. Wee Greenfield, Clemson
 John Hackett, Wayne State (Michigan)
 Charles Havens, Western Maryland
 Frank Howard, Clemson
 Woody Hughes, St. Thomas (Minnesota)
 Lawrence Kelly, Manhattan
 Ed Kluska, Xavier (Ohio)
 Chick Kolstad, St. Norbert
 Stan Lavine, M.D., Maryland, College Park
 Herb Laufer, Penn State - Behrend
 John Lawther, Penn State
 Rex Lee, Brigham Young
 Bill Loving, South Carolina
 Jerry Lyne, Loyola (Illinois)
 Carl Maddox, Louisiana State
 Jim Maloney, Temple
 Darlene May, Cal Poly Pomona
 Malcolm McLaren, Rutgers
 Tony Montonaro, Ohio State
 John Moorhouse, Bradley
 Thomas Morgan, Lehigh
 Thomas Nolan, Georgetown
 Ken Norton, Manhattan
 Kenneth Ober, Elizabethtown
 Mitchell Parkinson, Southern Illinois
 Jack Patterson, Baylor
 Frank Remington, Wisconsin
 Jerry Richardson, Central Florida
 Walter Roach, Texas Christian
 Tom Samuels, Eastern Kentucky
 Philip Shiye, Wooster
 Caroline Sinclair, James Madison

George Smith, Cincinnati
 Fred Stabley, Michigan State
 Col. John Stephens, Ret., Notre Dame
 McLean Stevenson, Northwestern
 Leo Strang, Kent State
 Robert Swint, M.D., Georgia Southern
 Charlie Tate, Miami (Florida)
 Bob Tompkins, Central Missouri State
 Dan Washington, Grambling
 Jim Weir, Maryland, College Park
 John Williams III, Virginia
 Ken Wiltgen, St. Mary's (Minnesota)
 Bob Wright, Illinois

Student-Athletes:

Gyprain Bailey, Fairmont State
 Marlin Barnes, Miami (Florida)
 Brook Berringer, Nebraska
 Tiger Bussey, Colorado
 Cornelius Chiles, Southwestern Oklahoma State
 Chris Daniels, Dayton
 Kathleen Meyers Grabemann, Loyola (Illinois)
 Telly Gatewood, Southwestern Oklahoma State
 Charles Gulley Jr., Southwestern Oklahoma State
 Julie Hansen, Wake Forest
 Jermaine Hopkins, Youngstown State
 Shannon McPherson, Indiana/Purdue-Indianapolis
 Greg Menton, Massachusetts
 Alvin Milton, Southwestern Oklahoma State
 Keane Poche, New Orleans
 Ian Sealy, Dickinson
 Willie Smith, Louisiana Tech
 Bill Tierney, Fordham
 Kimberly Toone, Albany of New York
 Aimee Willard, George Mason
 Tim Wilson, Maryland, College Park
 Christopher Yelverton, South Alabama

At this time, we would like to ask that you please rise for a moment of silence for those who have gone before us.

Thank you. If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact someone on the committee or someone on the national staff.

President Corrigan: Thank you very much, Barbara. We will have a supplemental report from the committee before the conclusion of the Convention.

Now, in order to conclude this opening session, we will have the annual State of the Association address from a former student-athlete, former coach, former athletics director and absolutely a super guy who made it through a tough year and kept a strong focus on this Association. It is a pleasure to introduce Cedric Dempsey. (Applause)

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

Cedric W. Dempsey: Thank you, President Corrigan, and good after-

noon. Before I begin my formal remarks, I would like to express a personal word of appreciation on behalf of June and our family for the support and concern many of you expressed to us this past year. Personally, we have experienced a most difficult time in our lives at the loss of our son. Your caring and thoughtfulness have provided tremendous strength for us during this time. We want to thank you for that.

Now, let me take you back more than 75 years ago to the 1920 NCAA Convention. Delegates at that Convention were discussing whether the Association should write legislation to regulate intercollegiate athletics — a practice it had not yet started.

Walter Camp, one of the Association's pioneers and the long-time football coach at Yale University, told this story. "A mother was in the nursery with her newborn baby, who was sleeping in the crib. Charlie, the father, came in and leaned over the crib and, with a concerned look, began saying something the mother couldn't hear. 'How Charlie does love that baby!', she thought, as she drew nearer to hear what she assumed were his loving words. Instead, she heard Charlie saying, 'It beats all how a crib like that could be made for two-and-a-half dollars!'"

But then Camp told the delegates, speaking again about the effect of creating national legislation, "Let us love the baby. Don't be quite so anxious about the crib it is in."

With this story, I think Camp was trying to tell the delegates to that 1920 Convention something important, something we lose sight of too often. Rather than worrying so much about the crib—our procedures and rules—we need to focus on the core of what intercollegiate athletics is all about, the student-athlete.

With this session, 77 years later, we are opening the last Convention of its kind. Today, I want to do what Walter Camp suggested and focus first on student-athletes. I want to spend some time looking back on what the Association has accomplished in the last decade and highlight some areas of real progress.

I also want to discuss the negative impact some processes and philosophical priorities have had on student-athletes and the Association. And finally, I want to show how going forward, focusing first on student-athletes, will help us remove some of that negative effect.

The last 10 years have been ones of significant progress for intercollegiate athletics. There is much of which we can justifiably be proud. Through initial-eligibility and continuing-progress rules, we have raised the academic standards student-athletes must achieve if they are going to compete in college sports on our campuses.

These efforts came as a result of criticism that some student-athletes were exploited and there was little concern for their academic success. The perception was that athletic talent was used until eligibility was exhausted, but the student-athletes didn't graduate. Although the reality was never as bad as the perception, higher education in intercollegiate athletics still took action.

But it hasn't been easy. Even as we raised the standards, we drew criticism that they were too high. But in staying the course, we have seen graduation rates rise. In 1992, when the first Division I graduation rates were published, student-athletes as a whole earned their degrees at a rate lower than the rest of the student body. By 1996, we have not only closed that gap, but student-athletes as a whole now graduate at a higher rate than the

rest of the student body. And, this has happened at a time when all college students are graduating at a higher rate than they did five years ago.

We have gained ground in all categories. The greatest gains have been among African-American men and women. Today, black male student-athletes are graduating 10 percentage points higher than they did five years ago and eight percentage points ahead of their peers in the entire student body. And black women student-athletes are graduating at a rate 13 points higher than five years ago and 15 points higher than their counterparts.

The most recent good news is that the enrollment figures for African-American student-athletes are beginning to show a trend toward the higher pre-Proposition 48 levels and that is a trend we will watch closely.

For those who did not graduate within the six-year limit, we established the Degree-Completion Program in 1987. That program helps student-athletes who have exhausted their eligibility but have not yet finished their degree requirements. A nearly \$9 million endowment funds that program.

In the 10 years since the program has been in place, \$4 million in grants have been approved. More than 700 students have received their undergraduate degrees. That is nearly 90 percent of those accepted into the program.

More assistance has been given through the academic-enhancement fund to make sure student-athletes get everything they need to succeed academically.

One Southern university used this fund to help a basketball student-athlete.

Based on his high-school record, he was viewed as academically at risk. Through the academic-enhancement fund, a very expensive test for diagnosing learning disabilities was purchased and the university discovered that this student-athlete had a problem processing information. The school was able to use the same funds to provide appropriate tutoring. As a result, he made the all-conference honor roll and has the second highest GPA on his team.

Not only have we worked diligently to ensure the academic success of student-athletes, we have also worked to improve their overall college experience. In a 1991 survey, student-athletes complained that their playing and practice schedules left them little extra time. You responded by placing limits on their daily and weekly practice and playing schedules. You limited their postseason commitments. In other words, you listened and made their life better.

You also responded financially with the special assistance fund at the Division I level. It was established to help underprivileged Division I athletes afford some very basic necessities in life, things the scholarship doesn't cover. Let me give you just one example: A football player at a Midwestern university had problems with his wisdom teeth, made worse by the steady use of a mouth guard. He was told that oral surgery would be required to remove all four wisdom teeth.

He had the surgery and then discovered his insurance wouldn't cover the cost. He got a student loan to cover part of it, but not enough. Through the special assistance fund, he got the balance—nearly \$800—and paid off his debt.

This is just one story. I know many of you have stories from your own campuses that you could tell.

Today, the fund has been increased from \$3 million to \$10 million a year,

and we have added to the flexibility of how those dollars may be used. Students whose parents can't afford to pay for their dental care, school supplies and other basic expenses now don't have those worries.

That added funding has been made possible by the extraordinary financial growth and stability of the Association in the last 10 years. The appeal of college sports has helped all of our programs increase our revenues. We have been able to capitalize on the popularity of our championships—especially the Division I men's basketball tournament.

Ten years ago, the general operating budget approved for the NCAA was \$57.4 million. Today, it is more than four times that—reaching \$239 million.

Ten years ago, we returned \$37 million of our revenues to the membership. Today, we will distribute nearly \$177 million to the membership, roughly three-quarters of our total revenues. That is close to five times what we returned just 10 years ago.

Revenues and distributions to the membership will increase steadily for the next six years, when, over that period, our projections indicate the membership can look forward to distributions, including championships of \$1.1 billion.

These dollars are much needed as each of you struggles to meet ever increasing demands for new programs and program upgrades. Indeed, these are dollars that benefit every student-athlete participating in NCAA college sports.

We can look back at this past decade and feel proud of the Association's reform legislation and the financial progress we have made.

Now, after hearing all the positive stories about the tremendous progress we have made in improving the experience and the welfare of the student-athlete, you might think such good news would be reflected in the public perception of intercollegiate athletics. But if you did, you would be wrong.

The irony is that after years of working to improve the welfare of the student-athletes, the NCAA is perceived as acting against the interests of those same student-athletes. And that's our fault.

I believe that this negative image is related to two areas: the first is our sometimes cumbersome process; the second is how we prioritize our principles.

I would like to spend a few moments on each of these areas.

Some of our processes, carefully constructed to be fair, occasionally create an impression of being just the opposite—of being unfair—of creating injustice. We can't let this continue.

As you know, when an athlete is in violation of our rules, regardless of the severity of the violation, the athlete must be declared ineligible. Then the institution must request reinstatement of eligibility. This process is frequently misunderstood. The media and public can easily jump to the conclusion that the student-athlete is a victim of injustice.

That is exactly what happened this past year in the case of the student-athletes who wagered a football jersey on the outcome of college games. In doing so, they violated our rules that prohibit gambling. Although you could argue whether or not their wager constituted gambling, the real issue was how the case was processed and perceived.

When the three athletes were declared ineligible, many in the public and media leaped to the conclusion that the athletes had just received the eligibility equivalent of the death penalty. In fact, we received many e-mails, calls and letters that reflected that belief.

The reality, of course, is that at no time were the student-athletes in danger of losing their eligibility forever over a minor violation. In fact, the process was over in a week and the student-athletes lost no playing time at all. But the damage to our image had already been done. Thus, the problem lies in the way we handle and communicate how that process works.

This past year we implemented Proposal 16. Much of the criticism this legislation has drawn is directed, again, not at the rule but at its implementation.

Students with excellent academic records who fail to meet each and every academic criterion for initial eligibility must use the waiver process. Having to do so creates great anxiety for those qualified students when they receive a nonqualification notice. It appears to many to be a grave injustice. In some cases, the information-gathering process and the ultimate decision took so long that some students missed a full season of competition. That should not happen. However, the majority of student-athletes who filed a waiver request became eligible, which shows that, in this case, too, the process works.

Another negative aspect to that situation is that high schools were unable to challenge directly the clearinghouse's decisions on what constitutes core courses. To do so, they had to find an NCAA member to file the appeal for them. High schools either didn't know about the process or thought it too cumbersome. As a result, many students, far too many, were forced to use the waiver request. The good news is, we have improved that process and you will be hearing more about those improvements in the next few weeks.

Having inefficient processes is one reason we draw criticism. Another relates to a bigger issue, how we seem to assign incorrect priority to our principles when they conflict.

Nothing illustrates this more than our present legislation limiting the student-athlete from working part-time while in school. While other students in Division I schools can determine whether or not they can handle a part-time paying job along with their academic responsibilities, student-athletes cannot.

Much of our legislation, including the prohibition against jobs, has been maintained upon building a level playing field. Let me hasten to note that this concept has helped intercollegiate athletes because it has meant more parity in competition. But in the end, we can never achieve a truly level playing field.

Each member institution has its own strengths and weaknesses, whether it is location, certain academic majors or a winning athletics tradition. No NCAA rules can or should ever change that.

But, because we fear that someone else may gain some slight advantage, we put the level playing field principle first.

We talk about protecting student-athletes from taking on too much, like a part-time job. But I think a major reason we have perpetuated that rule is to maintain a level playing field. For example, without our limitation on part-time work, University X would be afraid that University Y could recruit better players because there are better part-time jobs in Community Y. That priority is flat-out wrong.

Our amateurism principle also has had a significant effect on the financial needs of student-athletes. Let me make it clear that I do not advocate paying student-athletes. But if an English major who is not an athlete can earn money from writing, or a fine arts major who aspires to be an actor has an opportunity to earn money in his or her future field, I believe an athlete

who also has such talents should be allowed to take advantage of similar opportunities without affecting his or her financial aid.

By giving these two principles—the level playing field and amateurism—greater priority than the welfare of the student-athlete, I believe that we hurt more than the individual student-athlete. We feed the perception that the NCAA acts against the interests of student-athletes, which hurts the organization and every member institution.

Is it possible, then, to maintain the basic principles of the Association, yet do a better job of meeting the needs of student-athletes without sacrificing those basic principles? Absolutely. The solution is to re-evaluate our rules and processes to ensure that they focus first on the welfare of the student-athlete.

Let me offer a few examples of how we are already doing just that, and where you have an opportunity to do even more at this Convention.

The Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism and the financial aid committee, with support from the Council, have put forward Proposal 62, permitting student-athletes to work under certain conditions and to earn up to the cost of attendance. Even though this has failed at past Conventions, I encourage you to support this revised proposal. I fully recognize this might bring some minor imbalance to that level playing field, but within the parameters of the legislation, it addresses an important financial need for student-athletes.

Proposal No. 59 will take care of allowing some student-athletes to participate in activities that are now barred, like writing and acting. It does not allow payment for those activities, but it is a much-needed first step in putting student-athlete welfare ahead of the level-playing-field principle.

The Eligibility Committee is at work on its process and terminology.

At this Convention, we will vote on Proposition 98, introduced by the Eligibility Committee and supported by the Council, which will remove from the formal eligibility process de minimis violations that shouldn't affect the student-athlete's eligibility.

In addition, the Eligibility Committee will consider at its June meeting strategies that should make the eligibility system more user-friendly for student-athletes, institutions and the public.

The Academic Requirements Committee and the Committee to Oversee Implementation of the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse are working to clear up some of the problems with core course disputes, so that they can be handled in a better manner.

Fewer waiver requests and indeed fewer unnecessary problems for student-athletes should result.

These potential changes in priority of principle and in process all focus first on student-athletes and deserve your support.

Now, I want to return to Walter Camp and his comments to this Convention 77 years ago. He spoke to an organization poised at the edge of a great change.

As an organization, we are again poised at the threshold of another great change. We have been engaged for the last two years in a restructuring, which will probably be viewed as the most significant change since the founding of this organization 90 years ago.

At the conclusion of this Convention, we will have made a statement about the governance of college sports that will move us further toward our mission of making intercollegiate athletics an integral part of higher education.

We will have demonstrated, finally and firmly, that like all other aspects

of higher education, intercollegiate athletics belongs under the governing purview of college and university presidents.

In addition, we will have set in motion a federated structure that, more significantly than ever before, recognizes and accommodates the enormous diversity among the more than 900 active NCAA members.

With restructuring, each of the new governance groups will have the opportunity to review all of their rules and processes. I urge all of our governing groups to accept the challenge to retain our basic principles while improving the experience of the individual student-athlete.

With the upcoming inauguration in Washington, I am reminded of a quote from President Carter's inaugural address in 1977. He said at that time, "We must adjust to changing times and still hold to unchanging principles."

As we embark on a great change in this Association, I submit that we must hold to our unchanging principles. But as Walter Camp advocated, one principle is more equal than any of the others. In the end, what the NCAA is about, what your institutions are about, is the development and education of young people. We cannot, we should not allow any other principles to overshadow that mission.

As you begin the business of this Convention, I urge you to reflect on all the good things your institution and the NCAA have done in the last 10 years for young people. Think about the student-athletes you have nurtured and helped to grow and to flourish. Then focus first on student-athletes and what is best for them as you make your decisions.

Your work this week will ensure that when we look back, 10 years hence or even 77 years hence, this Convention will be seen as one that set a positive course for the organization for years to come. I am proud to be here to witness it, and I am proud to work with all of you to secure that future.

Thank you. (Applause)

President Corrigan: Thank you, Ced.

I would like to make a couple of announcements before you leave. Please note that tomorrow's Division II business session, from 9:45 to 12:30, will be held in the Tennessee Ballroom, as opposed to the Presidential B, as listed in the program. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause for our Division II delegates.

Also, please do not forget that we have our honors dinner tonight at 7:30 in the Delta Ballroom. You go out this door and walk four miles. If any of you want to come wearing your running shoes, we will understand. You are going to get plenty of exercise. It is great to be with you and we will see you tonight at the honors dinner. Thank you.

[The opening business session was adjourned.]

■ Division I-A Business Session

Monday Morning, January 13, 1997

The Division I-A business session was called to order at 9:45 a.m., with Carol Cartwright, Kent State University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Cartwright: Welcome to the Division I-A business session.

Let me call your attention to two of your Convention publications. First, in the Convention Program, see Pages 5 and 6. There you will find the program for this Division I-A business session, which is the session for Presidential Agenda Day. On Page 8, you will find the program for tomorrow's session. Then in your Official Notice, see Appendix A, Page 231, the blue pages. That lists the five proposals that we will take action on today and, if necessary, tomorrow. Today we will handle the Presidential Agenda Day items and then we will move ahead and handle any of the other items as time permits. If we are able to handle everything today, we will cancel the Division I-A business session that is scheduled for tomorrow. There is an incentive for you, absolutely. Please note that on Pages 2 and 3 of your Convention Program, there are corrections in several of the proposals in the Official Notice. They are merely revisions that do not alter the substance of the proposals themselves. We will first vote on the one item that requires a roll-call vote, and this is Proposal No. 65. Please remember that you will need your voting paddle and electronic voting unit for any vote in this session and through the remainder of the Convention. Our procedures dictate that all voting be done by paddle or electronically, rather than by voice or hand. We have a court reporter to prepare a transcript of this session, so we ask you to identify yourself and your institution or other affiliation whenever you speak. We will now consider and act upon the amendments offered for vote in this session. We will begin with Proposal No. 65.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Financial Aid—Summer School—Division I

Carl Asp (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I move for adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded]

The impetus for the legislation originated with the faculty reps from the CFA. It was not really inspired from the coaches' point of view. It provides increased flexibility for incoming students and is especially important with the increased academic standards. It is supported by Division I members of the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. One important thing: there is no increased costs with this, because you are limited to four additional summer sessions. This assistance would be prior to their initial term. Cedric Dempsey spoke in a positive way of helping student-athletes. From the academic point of view, this would be the best thing we could do for them. Thank you.

James M. O'Fallon (University of Oregon): I am speaking on behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference in opposition to Proposal No. 65. There are two reasons that look in somewhat different directions, but both of them move toward defeat of this proposal.

The first has to do with the process necessary in order to qualify people for receiving financial aid. We are contemplating here using the clearinghouse in order to get people within a month or so of the finish of their high-school degrees who are qualified for financial aid. I think most of our experience with the clearinghouse suggests that this is a very divisive proposition at best.

The other reason that looks against it is that it will work as an incentive to every institution—because of competitive pressure to bring in student-athletes whether they need the additional time or not, whether it will be better for them to be staying at home and putting some money in the bank to get ready to come to college or not—to bring them on campus early and get them started. Those are, I think, adequate reasons to vote against 65.

William E. Kirwan (University of Maryland, College Park): I would like to speak in support of this proposal. It seems to me to be very sensible legislation. It seems to me that it would provide a real advantage to students to allow them to begin their acclimation to the university in a more relaxed environment in a summer term. I recognize there will be a number of students who will be unable to participate in this perhaps because of the delays with the clearinghouse. But surely there will be a lot of students who can take advantage. We shouldn't prevent those students from taking advantage of this opportunity.

I strongly urge Division I to support this piece of legislation. I think it will help our student-athletes get off to a better academic start. Thank you.

William V. Muse (Auburn University): I would like to speak in support of this proposition. We are increasingly encouraging our students to come to the summer session prior to the beginning of the fall term, particularly when they need some bridge work to go into programs that may be difficult. If we are providing this opportunity for all of our students, and particularly those who may be at risk, we certainly should provide the same opportunity for our student-athletes. They particularly may need this assistance in order to do better academically during their first year in college. I would urge you to support this proposition.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-135) was defeated, 43-70-5.]

Ms. Cartwright: Proposal No. 65 is the only item on the Presidential Agenda Day, so we can now move on to the remainder of the agenda for the Division I-A business session. The rest of these proposals will not require a roll-call vote. You will need your paddles rather than your voting machines for the remaining proposals.

Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Divisions I and II Football

Laurie Massa (University of South Carolina, Columbia): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Recruiting Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit one telephone call to a prospect during the month of May of the prospect's junior year in high school, only in the sport of football. By allowing this one telephone contact in May, member institutions' coaching staff members would have the ability to assess the level of

interest that a prospect had in attending the institution. This will be a cost-savings measure for institutions. They won't have to make additional telephone calls, mailing and recruiting trips if the prospect is not interested.

Additionally, by adopting Proposal No. 99, member institutions would not be permitted to make additional telephone contacts before September 1 of the beginning of the prospect's senior year in high school, thus, eliminating any telephone calls during the month of August. Please join the Council and the Recruiting Committee in supporting the adoption of Proposal No. 99. Thank you.

Antonio T. Coley (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Miami, Florida): Student-Athlete Advisory Committee members, who represent over a quarter of a million athletes involved in college athletics, use two basic principles when deciding whether to support or oppose proposed legislation.

Those principles are: 1) Does the proposed legislation protect the welfare of the student-athlete; and, 2) Does the proposed legislation provide a greater opportunity for the student-athlete to be involved in college athletics?

Based on those two principles, we ask that you oppose Proposal No. 99. We feel that phone calls in the month of May, when most student-athletes are preparing for important high-school final exams, do not significantly increase the opportunity for student-athletes to participate in college athletics, nor will they in any way protect the welfare of the student-athlete. In fact, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes those calls may have a negative effect and they might cause a student-athlete to lose focus on those all-important finals. We, on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, feel the time and the necessity of those calls are inappropriate. Therefore, we again ask that you oppose Proposal No. 99. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-172) was adopted.]

Official Visits—Division I Football

Joseph R. Castiglione (University of Missouri, Columbia): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move Proposal No. 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

Passage of this proposal will amend the present NCAA bylaw to create much-needed flexibility for institutions to carry over or "bank" a maximum of six unused official visits only in the sport of football. The proposal specifies that these unused visits may only be used during the subsequent academic year.

In the sport of football, institutions must strategically utilize the limited number of official visits in conjunction with a number of available grants they wish to award in a given year. Simply put, during the years when the institution can only offer a minimum number of grants, full use of the total number of official visits isn't necessary. Conversely, when an institution can award the maximum number of scholarships, the number of official visits are not sufficient. For example, if an institution used only 50 visits in year one, it would have 62 visits available in the following year.

Once again, the unused visits would not carry over more than one year. This proposed modification will not create any significant additional expense or administrative oversight. This is a common sense improvement. I enthusiastically urge your support of Proposal No. 110.

R. C. Johnson (University of Memphis): I rise in support of Proposal No. 110. In this age of cost containment and increased pressure on football to

generate more dollars, the banking of six official visits seems most prudent at this time. It is not difficult to keep track of the visits. At one time, we allowed 95 and we were able to keep track of them. We need to allow for some variables for the number of visits. It appears to be sound legislation. I would urge your support of Proposal No. 110. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 110 (Page A-188) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Spring Practice—Divisions I and II Football

Ms. Cartwright: We are ready for the last item on our agenda, which is Proposal No. 125. It is our understanding that this may be withdrawn, but it looks like we have someone at the microphone.

Dennis Wilson (Auburn University): With all due respect to the Council's decision to withdraw its support, I would like to move consideration of Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports has developed proposed legislation to address the injury risk in spring football. The legislation proposes three changes: the spring football contact days should be reduced from 10 to five while maintaining 15 total practice opportunities; the initial two-practice opportunity should be non-contact; and three, the shoulder pads should not be worn in noncontact practices.

The committee has initiated this legislation because it has established a principle that student-athletes in any sport should not be exposed to an out-of-season risk that is higher than that experienced during the regular season. The data from the NCAA injury surveillance system reveal that the injury risk for an individual in spring football is more than twice that of the fall practice. In addition, injuries that involve significant health consequences, such as concussions, injuries requiring surgery and injuries to the anterior cruciate ligament are two to three times more likely in the spring.

The proposed legislation is based on what the committee believes is solid research and consistency with the existing legislation. In fact, it is supported by the college and university athletic trainers committee, the American Orthopedic Society for Sports Medicine and the American Medical Society for Sports Medicine.

The rationale for reduced contact is as follows: Over 80 percent of spring practice injuries occur in contact practices. To reduce the injury rate in the spring practice, modifications must begin with this activity. Injury surveillance data show two specific examples when a reduction in spring practice contact days had an immediate effect on the injury rates and no apparent effect on the quality of the sport. It should be noted that these practice reductions were driven by our Presidents Commission's desire to decrease time demands on student-athletes in the sport of football rather than injury concerns.

First, in the spring of 1990, Division II held only 12 practices, none of which involved contact. In 1990, Division II spring-injury rates were more than 50 percent lower than previous or subsequent years when contact practices were allowed. Secondly, in the spring of 1991, Division I schools reduced spring football contact days from 15 to 10. The injury rate that year increased 20 percent. The rationale for two initial noncontact practices is as follows: existing legislation requires that the first three practice days in the fall be

limited to noncontact conditioning drills to allow the student-athlete to climatize to the activity.

This proposed legislation recognizes the need for a similar climatization in the spring and the rationale for no shoulder pads in noncontact practices. The legislation permitting shoulder pads during designated noncontact spring practice was approved in 1994 against the competitive safeguards committee's recommendations. Since that time, there has been no significant reduction in shoulder injuries in such practices as was originally claimed. In addition, the percent of injuries occurring in noncontact practices has increased. In fact, in some institutions, there is now little difference in contact and noncontact practices.

In conclusion, the committee on competitive safeguards strongly believes that the difference in regular- and out-of-season football practice injury rates is real, significant and preventable. We urge your support of this legislation.

Michael A. Tranghese (Big East Conference): The Collegiate Commissioners Association has met with several of the constituent groups that have an interest in this particular proposal.

There exists real differences on a number of issues within this proposal, such as the number of days to be deleted from spring practice as well as the number of days before the first contact begins. We believe that the committee on competitive safeguards should be complimented for their role in bringing this to the Convention's attention. Since the effective date of the legislation, as proposed, is August 1, 1997, the proposal is applicable for the first time for spring practice in 1998, we would like to propose that this issue be referred to the Championships Cabinet. The Championships Cabinet has the ability to work with the committee on competitive safeguards, the American Football Coaches Association and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, as well as the National Association of Athletic Trainers and other groups that have an interest in the welfare of the football student-athlete and to build a consensus.

The Cabinet can complete its work this year and the newly constituted Management Council can give us a resolution in time for spring practice, 1998, which is the effective date of the current proposal. Your consideration is appreciated.

Ms. Cartwright: We now have on the floor a motion to refer. Is there a second to that motion?

Antonio T. Coley (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Miami, Florida): We, as a committee, have taken no position on Proposal No. 125 for the following reasons. After separating the issues, we agree that it would be beneficial to the welfare of the student-athlete to not allow contact drills on the first two days of spring practice to allow for further conditioning and acclimation. We also agree that no shoulder pads should be worn on designated noncontact days.

As a Division I football player, I can tell you from personal experience that as long as shoulder pads are involved in drills, there is really no difference between contact and noncontact days. Although they were not intended to be, shoulder pads are an offensive, not a defensive piece of equipment. We, on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, feel that noncontact drills should be just that, noncontact. The primary reason behind our not taking a position on this entire issue is that we cannot reach a consensus concerning the issue of reducing the number of contact days from 10 to five.

Although we agree that a reduction in contact days would be beneficial

to the welfare of the student-athletes in some areas, we do not support such a drastic reduction. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-205) was referred to the Championships/Competition Cabinet in Division I-A and I-AA; referred to Division II Management Council in Division II.]

Ms. Cartwright: That concludes the business of the Division I-A business session.

[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.]

■ Division I-AA Business Session

Monday Morning, January 13, 1997

The Division I-AA business session was called to order by Claudius E. Watts III, The Citadel, at 9:45 a.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Watts: Ladies and gentlemen, the 1997 Division I-AA business session is now officially open. I'm Bud Watts. To set the record straight, I'm a "has-been" president of the Citael. Dr. Thurston Banks is serving as parliamentarian for us today. Ms. Jackie Hudson from the NCAA staff is here to provide advice and counsel, and Mr. Rick Perko from the NCAA staff also is with us.

This is a very, very historic meeting today. Some of you who have been attending these Conventions for 25 to 30 years can remember when the group probably was not much larger than this for the entire organization. Some of you may be at your very first NCAA Convention. You are at a Convention that will be important for the significance of the changes that will result from your participation. Our organization is poised to make a great leap forward, a leap that will posture the NCAA to meet the great opportunities and the challenges that collegiate athletics will face in the 21st century. The legislation that is before this Convention sets forth a governance system that features greater federation, greater presidential authority and simplified administrative structure. I welcome your participation in this historic event. As Ced Dempsey said last night, our focus should be on providing for the betterment of student-athletes throughout our country.

Administratively, I need to call your attention to your two Convention publications. First, the Convention Program. If you will check Page 6, you will find the agenda for our business session today on Presidential Agenda Day. On Page 8, if we need a session tomorrow, there's an agenda. I do not believe that will be necessary. In your Official Convention Notice, if you will check Appendix A, Page 231, you will find four proposals that we may have to take action on today. None of the proposals that we'll vote on today require roll-call vote. Therefore, you need only a voting paddle for this session. Our procedures dictate that all voting will be done by paddle rather than by voice or by hand. There is a court reporter to take a transcript of our session, so we ask that those of you who choose to speak, please identify yourself and your institution or your affiliation when you begin to speak.

We'll now consider and act upon the amendments offered for vote in this session. I would urge the members to be aware that there will be some discussion following the proposals that are up for vote that concerns the restructuring proposals that will be on the floor either in Division I or for the entire Convention. The floor is now open for the conduct of Division I-AA business.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Divisions I and II Football

Charles N. Lindemenn (Montana State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Recruiting Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

This would permit one phone call to prospects during May of their junior year in high school. By allowing one phone call in May, member institution coaching staffs would have the ability to assess the level of interest that a prospect has in attending the institution. This assessment would result in a cost-saving measure by the institution since it would not have to make additional phone calls, mailings or recruiting trips if a prospect is not interested. Additionally, by adopting Proposal 99, coaching staffs would not be able to call the prospect prior to September of the prospect's senior year in high school, thus eliminating any phone calls during the month of August. Please join the Council and the Recruiting Committee in adopting Proposal 99.

Charles Wiley (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Georgia Institute of Technology). We, the members of the committee, who represent over a quarter-million student-athletes involved with college athletics, concur with the views of Executive Director Dempsey in using two basic principles when deciding to propose or oppose prospective legislation: A. Does it protect the welfare of the student-athlete? B. Does the proposed legislation provide a greater opportunity for students to be involved in college athletics?

Based on these two principles, we ask that you oppose Proposal 99. We feel that phone calls made in the month of May when most student-athletes are preparing for crucial final exams and college entrance exams would negatively compromise the focus of the student. Speaking from experience, these phone calls act as an annoyance. In the current process, students receive sufficient information in order to make a logical decision. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee asks that you vote in opposition to Proposal 99.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): Could I ask the Council representative if the Council has had an opportunity to consider the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's views?

Constance H. Hurlbut (Patriot League): I have to admit, Bud, that it was a summer meeting and I had a baby. I don't mean to make light of this. I don't recall the discussions specifically. I'm not sure at the time that we supported the legislation, quite honestly. I don't think when the Council took its support on this in August, we did not have the opinion of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Mr. Lindemenn: Bud, I just wanted to let you know that the Recruiting Committee did not have the input of the student-advisory committee. This was a proposal that was brought forth by coaches and the response was to coaches.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-172) was defeated.]

Official Visits—Division I Football

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, we would like to move Proposal 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

I bring this issue to this body purely for the reason that it is sponsored by some of our I-A friends, and I think that this group should have the opportunity to vote on it. Proposal 110 allows an institution to officially "bank" official visits and use them in subsequent years. Up to six unused visits from the prior year may be banked. With a change in staffs and limitations on scholarships being what they are, you may have one year where you do not need as many official visits as you do the next year. This proposal would allow you to average them over a period of time. In all fairness, I think the proposal also has the ability to have some abuses. This will have to be monitored on each campus carefully so that we're not simply extending the number of visits each year by six.

[Proposal No. 110 (Page A-188) was defeated.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Spring Practice—Divisions I and II Football

Bernie DePalma (Cornell University): I am a member of the NCAA safeguards committee. With all due respect to the Council's decision to withdraw support, I would like to move consideration for Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports has developed proposed legislation to address the injury risk in spring football. The legislation proposes three changes: Spring football contact dates should be reduced from 10 to five days while maintaining 15 total practice opportunities. The initial two practice opportunities should be non-contact. Shoulder pads should not be worn in noncontact practices.

The committee has initiated this legislation because it has established a principle that student-athletes in any sport should not be exposed to an out-of-season injury risk that is higher than that experienced in the regular season. Data from the NCAA Injury Surveillance System shows that an injury from an out-of-season spring football practice is more than twice that of fall practice. In addition, injuries that involve significant health consequences, such as concussions, injuries requiring surgery and anterior cruciate ligament injury, are more than three times likely in the spring. The proposed legislation is based on what the committee believes is solid research and is supported by the National Athletic Trainers Association, the American Orthopedic Association, the American Medical Association for Sports Medicine and those physicians who aid our student-athletes. Over 80 percent of spring practice injuries occur in contact practices. To reduce the injury rate in spring practice, modification must begin with this activity. Injury surveillance data show that when the spring contact practices began, it had an immediate effect on injury rates.

In the spring of 1990, Division II held spring practice with no contact. The injury rates were more than 50 percent lower than previous or subsequent years in which contact practices were involved. In the spring of 1991, Division I schools reduced spring football contact days from 15 to 10. The injury rate that year decreased 20 percent. Existing legislation requires that the first three practice days in fall football be limited to noncontact conditioning drills to allow the student to acclimate to the activity. The proposed legislation recognizes the need for this same acclimation in spring.

Legislation permitting the use of shoulder pads during designated non-contact spring practices was approved in 1994 against the competitive safeguards committee's recommendation. Since that time, there has been no sig-

nificant reduction of shoulder injuries in such practices as was originally claimed. In addition, the percentage of injuries occurring in noncontact practices increased. The competitive safeguards committee believes that the difference in the regular- and out-of-season injury rates is real, significant and preventable. We urge your support of this legislation.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): The Collegiate Commissioners Association has met with several groups that have an interest in this proposal. There exists real differences on a number of issues within the proposal such as the number of days to be deleted from spring practice, the number of days prior to first contact, etc.

We believe that the committee on competitive safeguards should be complimented on its role in bringing this to the Convention's attention. Since this legislation is proposed for August 1997, making it first applicable for spring 1998, we would like to propose that this be referred to the Championships Cabinet. The Championships Cabinet has the ability to work with the committee on competitive safeguards, the student-athletes, the National Association of Athletic Trainers and others groups that have a real interest in the welfare of football student-athletes to build a consensus. The Cabinet can complete its work this year and the newly constituted Management Council can give us a resolution in time for spring practice 1998, which is the effective date of the current proposal. I would urge this group to refer this to the Championship Cabinet.

[The motion to refer was seconded.]

Ms. Hurlbut: I just wanted to note that although the Council withdrew its support for this legislation at this time, it would support the motion to refer because of the window created with the new structure.

Mr. DePalma: The competitive safeguards committee is in support of that motion.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-205) was referred to the Championships/Competition Cabinet.]

DISCUSSION

Mr. Watts: That concludes the business that's on the agenda for this body. However, there are two other items to discuss. At this time I would recognize Wright Waters to discuss Proposal 17.

Mr. Waters: Mr. Chairman, first of all, after having this group chaired in past years by Rich Ensor and Patty Viverito, I would like to say how nice it has been to have someone chair it whose accent I understood. We've had considerable discussion in the lobbies and at various conference meetings in the past few months about Proposal 17. It's been described as everything from a move that will ensure that we never hear the terms I-AA and I-AAA again, but only Division I; to being described as a hostile takeover of I-AA by I-AAA. So perhaps the proponents of 17 could speak to it and we could learn more about it. Thank you.

Linda M. Bruno (Atlantic 10 Conference): Proposition 17 allows us to delete the reference of I-AA on the board of directors. It would help the subdivision work together better. It does not delete the reference in any other body. It could be considered almost an internal thing to help us work better and to put the best people forward. I would urge you to support it.

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): I'm the person somewhat responsible for Proposal 17, so I'd like to give some background on the genesis of this proposal, a little bit about what it does and what it's not

intended to do. The genesis of this proposal actually came from the I-AA national meeting at NACDA last year. There was a relatively high level of frustration being expressed at that meeting about how our nonfootball programs become labeled I-AA or I-AAA. As recently as this fall, there was a reference to Division I-A basketball programs in *The NCAA News*. We saw that labeling disheartening, certainly unwarranted. It was our intention to bring this forward to try to end that sort of misleading labeling. It seems to be more and more prevalent when our internal publications start making those references.

A couple of things it will not do. It will not materially affect how we do business in the restructured NCAA. It will not change the balance of representation on any body within the Division I structure. It will not change each subdivision's responsibility to achieve diverse representation. To be really honest with you, it doesn't do much in terms of substance. I guess you could realistically say, "what's the point?" The point is largely symbolic, but I don't think the message that would be sent is insignificant nevertheless. I think it is a small step to just say we are Division I for all of our programs—football is subdivided between I-A and I-AA. It is meant to be nothing more than that, nothing less than that and no one should fall on a sword over No. 17. It should not be divisive. It just shouldn't be.

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Athletic Conference): I rise in support of Proposal 17, after much debate within our conference. At one point, we were opposing it, but we've come around to supporting it. At a time when we're working so well together in I-AA and I-AAA, we should not let this become a divisive issue. Today, I think we made great progress at this Convention of showing a unified front on the restructuring issues. This is a small issue and a minor adjustment in terminology. I don't think it should cause a divisive debate on the Convention floor later today. We would also suggest that whatever problems might be posed in terms of perception with this proposal could certainly be worked out over the long term under the restructured governance. There aren't going to be many adjustments in how I-AA and I-AAA are classified. I don't think we should set a bad tone as we start this debate.

Larry L. Travis (Western Carolina University): If there's really no substance, why do we need to change this? Division I-AA has come a long way as far as our perception. I think we need to be able to keep that. We have a philosophy in I-AA, those of us who like to play at a certain level. We would like to be able to keep that distinction. I think it's important as things happen with restructuring that we be able to keep a relationship with our I-A people and not be classified or thrown into one situation. There is no guarantee that we're all going to be called Division I or Division I-A. I think it's very important that we have that.

The at-large representation is something that I also would like to have clarified. If we give up our I-AA, does that affect our at-large representation to the Management Council and other cabinets?

Mr. Watts: There's a question on the floor about at-large representation. Does anyone on the floor wish to respond to that question? Jackie Hudson will provide an answer for you, Larry.

Jacqueline Hudson (NCAA Staff): Right now, there are two at-large positions from I-AA and/or I-AAA on the Management Council. That's the way it's phrased now, so that won't change. If you eliminate the I-AA or I-AAA representation, you will probably just have two at-large positions from

other than I-A. So you are not going to lose your at-large positions. You are still going to have those numbers. They just won't be labeled with the specific subdivisions.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): Jackie, I agree with what you've said because the at-large positions are in the legislation. But at any one time, you could then have the two at-large positions coming from institutions or from conferences that are not historically known as I-AAA. Is that not correct?

Ms. Hudson: Yes.

Mr. Waters: That's correct. There's another thing I've heard today that I'm a little concerned about because I don't know how it works. We've struggled with this issue on the transition Management Council from the "git-go" to make sure that the issue of diversity was applied to each subdivision. Now, I've heard an earlier speaker suggest that this does not eliminate either I-AA or I-AAA but would keep their diversity pools intact and I-AAA institutions would have the same responsibility to diversity that I-AA does. My question is, if 17 passes, is the diversity issue now total so that I-AA and I-AAA conferences collectively would have the commitment to diversity that I-A has? I will leave you with that thought.

Ms. Viverito: When I've raised that question, I've been told unequivocally that it does not change subdivisional diversity. Our requirements to achieve diversity across subdivisional lines is in different parts of the legislation. It is certainly not the sponsor's intent to change those diversity requirements.

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): What will this do to Proposition 42?

Mr. Waters: Sondra, I don't believe this changes 42 because the I-AA governance model would have to obviously be amended so that it identifies the people who are actually playing football. You raised a good point. But it was certainly the intention of the authors of 42 to specify that it would only be those conferences playing football that would be involved in the governance. But without some amendment to 42, I guess the way it's written it would open it up. I just think it further complicates the issue. We are conferences with differences and this thing is becoming so complicated that maybe we don't have time to think through all of those things. Sondra, you make a good point.

Mr. Watts: Proposition 42 has been reordered and will be considered prior to Proposition 17.

Constance H. Hurlbut (Patriot League): That was going to be my point. When we actually vote on 42, the technical line will still exist. It will be clear that by the time we get to 17, Proposal 42 is the I-AA governance structure that will be established and the participants in it will be defined.

Hoke L. Smith (Towson State University): I came to this meeting with little knowledge of this. As I've listened to the discussion though, it seems to me that the questions that divide Division I-AA and I-AAA over football are much smaller than the questions that may unite us in the restructured format. Many of us have concerns about the ultimate outcome of having I-A dominate the financial scene inasmuch as they are with the proportional share. I guess my initial reaction would make it much easier for I-AA and I-AAA to maintain a united front on issues that affect the balance of our sports.

Mr. Watts: Thank you, President Smith. Are there any other comments

with regard to 17? Sondra, was your question answered with regard to Prop 42?

Ms. Norrell-Thomas: If it's going to be reordered and it's coming in, we're going to vote on 17 at this point and then in the general?

Mr. Watts: No. We won't vote on this now, Sondra. It will be in the Division I business session. Proposal 42 will be brought forward prior to 17.

Is there any other business to come before this business session? Ladies and gentlemen, again I want to thank you for your attention today. It's a very historic moment. Give yourselves a great hand for the last Division I-AA business session.

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at 10:21 a.m.]

■ Division I-AAA Business Session

Monday Morning, January 13, 1997

The Division I-AAA business session was called to order at 9:45 a.m., with Joseph A. Etzel, University of Portland, presiding.

[Note: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Etzel welcomed the delegates and introduced fellow Division I-AAA Council members. After referring the delegates to corrections to certain proposals in the Official Notice, Mr. Etzel invited the delegates to step forward with comments or questions about proposed legislation.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

A delegate asked for clarification and rationale from the sponsors of Proposal No. 32 regarding the level of participation in football as one of the factors in sports committee participation.

A delegate urged the delegation to vote in favor of Proposal No. 17. A straw vote indicated a large majority of the delegates supported Proposal No. 17.

A straw vote indicated majority support for Proposals Nos. 32 and 35-1.

A straw vote indicated that the delegates did not support Proposal No. 66.

A delegate lobbied for the defeat of Proposal No. 114 and a clarification of Proposal No. 65 was given.

A straw vote indicated slight support for Proposal No. 62 without Part B included in the legislation. With Part B included in the legislation, the delegates opposed Proposal No. 62.

A straw voted indicated opposition to Proposal No. 68.

[The Division I-AAA business session was adjourned at 10:13 a.m.]

■ Division II Business Session

Monday Morning, January 13, 1997

The Division II business session was called to order at 10:30 a.m., with Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Dorn: Good morning. On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome all of you to the Division II business session. We appreciate your participation and look forward to a very positive Convention.

To my immediate right is our parliamentarian, Mr. Paul Engelmann, from Central Missouri State University. He serves as a professor of economics at his institution and you may have noticed that he was also given the privilege as serving as the parliamentarian in the general session. Division II is really pleased to have you. Thanks a lot, Paul.

[Note: Various introductions and announcements were made.]

We are going hear a few words from Adam Herbert. He is going to give us an update on the work of the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission on the Division II Council Transition Team. Adam was one of the primary architects for the Association's new structure. He certainly is an outstanding leader for Division II during this critical transition period and certainly has helped develop a very positive relationship between the Presidents Council and the Management Council Transition Team that I believe is based upon cooperation and trust.

As a sidebar, I think it's important for you to note that Adam is very active in having the Jaguars become a part of Jacksonville. All day yesterday, I was telling Adam what a special, dear friend he was. He's a super friend, I mean he was my most ... and then they lost. So I'm not sure that you are as close of a friend as you were yesterday, but I want you to know that you are a true friend to Division II, our leader Mr. Adam Herbert.

Adam W. Herbert (University of North Florida): Thank you very much, Lynn. I'm just proud to live in Jacksonville and we're just hoping that very shortly our Jaguars will become America's team.

On behalf of the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission and Division II Presidents Council Transition Team, I am extremely proud to advise you today that Division II is now fully prepared to implement the new governance structure and could do so as early as today. Obviously, we are well ahead of schedule. In fact, we're clearly ahead of the August 1 implementation date. I think this demonstrates that our division is leading the NCAA in the shaping of the future of our Association.

Allow me to briefly summarize what we have been able to accomplish in terms of restructuring over the course of the past year. The Presidents Council is now in place and fully operating. The Management Council is in place and operating. Our Division II staff is in place and we're ready to go. They are working very hard on our behalf. The core of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is in place and we anticipate that the full committee should be

completed by April. A budget finance subcommittee is in place and chaired by the vice-chair of the Presidents Council. They have had several meetings that you will be hearing more about today.

A number of project teams have been established to address a wide array of critical Division II issues ranging from membership compliance to championships, to financial aid, to membership requirements and a number of others. You will have reports again today and tomorrow on the work of a number of these committees.

I know that last year there were some who were uncertain as to whether or not presidents would be willing to devote the time to Division II issues as was called for in the restructuring process. I want you to know that the members of the Presidents Council have clearly answered those concerns with a resounding "yes, we're willing, we're more than prepared to assume our responsibilities."

Every president on the Presidents Council is taking part actively and is fully engaged in addressing the critical challenges that are confronting this division. The time they are devoting to the Association and in particular to our division, has been exemplary and extensive; whether it has been telephone conference calls, e-mail messages going back and forth, actual face-to-face meetings, reviewing materials. In a wide array of ways, they have demonstrated their willingness to actively take part in this process. I would like to introduce them. You will note that they come from across the country, that they represent a wide array of our institutions and also reflect the diversity of our membership.

Let me ask you all to stand as I call your names: Bob Burnett, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Tony Ceddia, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, who is vice-chair of our Presidents Council; Charles Dunn from Henderson State University; Marvalene Hughes, California State University, Stanislaus; Gladys Styles Johnston, University of Nebraska, Kearney; Jessica Kozloff, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania; Jerry McGee, Wingate University; Allen Lee Sessoms, Queens College of New York; Al Shannon, Saint Joseph's College; and John Wolfe, Savannah State College. These are presidents who are working so hard on your behalf. I hope you'll join me in thanking them for what they are doing for all of us. I also want to acknowledge Asa Green, who is a consultant to our division and has been enormously helpful as we've addressed several critical issues during this transition process. Asa, thank you very much for your support, and leadership and guidance.

Also, I must note that there were some who were worried that in the restructured NCAA, presidents would begin to micromanage the affairs of the division. To that fear, I think we have provided a very strong and firm answer: "No, we will not." The presidents have focused very appropriately on philosophy and values, on strategic direction, on policy and effective division operation. We are clearly looking to the Management Council and staff to address the day-to-day affairs of the division. I think those colleagues who you see here at the stage and other members of the Management Council are doing an outstanding job of fulfilling those responsibilities.

I am very proud to report that our Presidents and Management Council Transition Teams are working very well together. We look forward over the course of the next several weeks to increase student-athlete involvement in this process as we go forward. Be assured that the Presidents Council is strongly committed to the principles of broad-based participation of mem-

ber institutions in the affairs of the division; of assuring greater awareness of division issues; to assure greater diversity on all division decision-making bodies. We're committed to prudent management of division resources, we are committed to assuring sensitivity to the needs, the problems and opportunities afforded our student-athletes, and we're determined to be innovative and creative as we plan for the future of Division II.

In short, on behalf of the Presidents Council, I am pleased to report that we are making outstanding progress in Division II. I hope that you share our pride in our record of significant accomplishment, which has been made possible because of your faith in restructuring as well as the outstanding efforts of colleagues who have given so generously of their time, their vision and their energy to build the strongest division in the NCAA. Thank you very much.

Ms. Dorn: Thank you, Adam. We're very appreciative of your time, commitment and your leadership and efforts as well. Thank you very much.

Before beginning the formal voting, we also have to consider our first issue of business, which is to ratify the individuals selected to fill the positions on the Division II Management Council. Our new constitution requires all Management Council selections to be ratified by the Division II membership at the subsequent NCAA Convention. This ratification is not a call for initial nomination. It is a formal acceptance of the members of the Management Council as approved by the Presidents Council. A chart detailing the composition of this group has been distributed. At this time, may I have a motion for ratification?

[The motion was made, seconded and approved.]

Congratulations to the members of the Management Council. We again look forward to your service for the rest of the Association and certainly Division II. I'd also like at this time to publicly congratulate Clint Bryant, director of athletics at Augusta College, who will serve as the vice-chair for the Management Council.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Ms. Dorn: We're ready to proceed with the proposed legislation. We're going to start with Proposal No. 22.

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division II Presidents Council

Adam W. Herbert (University of North Florida): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, the Council, the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams, I move Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

As indicated in the rationale statement, Proposal 22 essentially fine tunes the legislation that we adopted at last year's Convention, which established the Division II Presidents Council. It clarifies the duties of the Division II Presidents Council and the new governance structure and also specifies the duties of both the chair and the vice-chairs of the Presidents Council.

The adoption of this proposal is essential for the effective operation for the new Division II governance structure. We urge that this proposal be adopted.

[Proposal No. 22 (Page A-27) was adopted, 233-0-3.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring— Division II Administrative Committee

Charles D. Dunn (Henderson State University): On behalf of the

Presidents Commission and the Council, I move proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 23 would establish a Division II Administrative Committee as a part of the Association's new governance structure. Such a committee is necessary in that it would act for either the Management Council or the Presidents Council between their regularly scheduled meetings and be comprised of representatives of both bodies. One caveat should be noted. When issues are brought before the Administrative Committee that clearly fall within the sole jurisdiction of the Presidents Council, only Presidents Council representatives on the Administrative Committee will have a vote or will have the authority to act.

The establishment of this type of committee seems to be a necessary part of the NCAA Division II governance structure. I urge your support.

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): I was a member of the project team that developed this proposal. The project team saw a clear need for this type of committee within the new Division II governance structure.

On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, the Management Council Transition Team and the governance project team, I encourage the delegates to vote in support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 23 (Page A-29) was adopted, 233-0-3.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring— Division II Budget and Finance Committee

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and Council as well as the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams, I move Proposal 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 24 would establish a Division II Budget and Finance Committee as part of the Association's new governance structure. Such a committee is clearly necessary within the new Division II governance structure inasmuch as Division II will be guaranteed at least 4.37 percent of the Association's annual operating revenue.

This group will review and make recommendations related to the Division II budget as well as the division's fiscal and budgetary policy. As is stated in the rationale statements, this also helps to ensure chief executive officers involvement in every phase of the budget process in Division II. I urge our colleagues to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 24 (Page A-30) was adopted, 233-1-3.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division II Management Council

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission as well as the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council Transition Teams, I move Proposal 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal clarifies the legislation that was adopted at last year's Convention, which established a Division II Management Council.

The Division II Management Council will be made up of athletics administrators, senior women administrators, faculty athletics directors and conference commissioners. This proposal specifies additional duties and responsibilities, clarifies issues related to terms of office for service, and sets forth

the operating rules of the Management Council. The proposal also specifies the duties of the chair and vice-chair of the Division II Management Council. This proposal is extremely important to efficient operation of our new Division II governance structure. I urge your support.

Dan O'Callaghan (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Rollins College): It is not our intent to oppose this legislation; however, as the Division II management restructure continues in its evolution, we would like to raise awareness of certain student-athlete concerns.

First of all, we wish to extend our appreciation to the Division II leadership for its consideration to our committee in the new restructuring plan. However, we are concerned with the fact that we will have neither a vote nor representation on the proposed Management Council. We firmly believe that our direct participation on the Management Council can only enhance the advancement of the new structure.

Furthermore, we hope we can develop a partnership in the development of the committee structure and that our representation on these committees is seriously considered. In a very short time, we have been able to develop a vast network to canvass student-athlete advisory committees. In order to accurately represent this multitude of student-athletes, our membership on the Council is essential. Those of you who have interacted with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee have witnessed the hard work and determination in which we approach our responsibilities. It is our pledge that we will dedicate ourselves to the betterment of the Division II Management Council with this same effort and enthusiasm. Thank you for your consideration.

Robert A. Burnett (Armstrong Atlantic State College): I would like to speak in support of this proposal on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Division II Presidents Council Transition Team.

We believe that the modifications that are identified in this proposal as they relate to the modification of the duties and the terms of service on the Division II Management Council are necessary for us to effectively begin the implementation of the new governance structure. I urge your support of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 25 (Page A-31) was adopted, 233-1-3.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—NCAA Committee Structure

Adam W. Herbert (University of North Florida): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 28-0.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 28-0. This proposal sets forth a committee structure for Division II in which issues that are specific to our division membership would be reviewed and addressed. It has been developed by the Division II transition teams and clearly does reflect the restructuring themes of simplification, federation and streamlining of the Association's administrative structure. I should note that although each division has developed its own unique committee structure, there will be opportunities for the committees of all three divisions to meet together to address issues that affect all of us.

In fact, opportunities for interaction between committees are important elements in the new structure and also the Association's Executive

Committee, which will assist in assuring that this collaboration occurs.

The Presidents Commission and the Council urge your support of Proposal 28-0.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): On behalf of the Division II Presidents Council and the Management Council Transition Teams, I speak in support of Proposal No. 28, Section 0.

Since the last Convention, the governance project team worked closely with the groups that established the Division II committee structure set forth in this proposal. This new structure will provide our division with committees that will handle Division II championships, infractions cases, eligibility standards and cases, legislation, membership issues, committee nominations, student-athlete issues, and academic requirements. In addition, this proposal will maintain the current Division II sports committee structure so these committees can analyze their composition and duties over the next 18 months to determine if changes are necessary.

In developing the new Division II committee structure, there were two goals in mind. First, we wanted to develop a structure that guarantees that Division II issues will be reviewed and considered by Division II representatives. This principle of self-governance and the simplicity of the organizational structure helps to secure in the new structure the duties and responsibilities that are vested in the various Division II committees. For example, a Division II infractions case will be judged by a committee made up of Division II representatives.

Second, we wanted to create a committee structure that increases the number of opportunities for individuals at Division II institutions to be involved in the governance process. This increase has occurred as a result of the new Division II committee structure. As a result, the opportunities for Division II representation on NCAA committees will increase from 62 positions in the current structure to 106 positions in the new Division II committee structure. This does not include the number of opportunities for service on Division II sports committees.

For these reasons, the transition teams urge your support of Proposal No. 28-0.

[Part O of Proposal No. 28 (Page A-36) was adopted, 236-2-2.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division II Legislative Process

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams, I speak in favor of Proposal 51.

At the 1996 Convention, as a part of the restructuring legislation, the Division II membership approved revisions to the legislative sponsorship requirements for amendments to the Division II legislation.

Proposed Division II legislation considered at future NCAA Conventions will require at least 15 institutions or two conferences as sponsors. This legislative change has an effective date of August 1, 1997. Since this effective date is two weeks later than the Division II legislative sponsorship deadline of July 15, the transition team believes it is necessary to amend the effective date so that these new sponsorship requirements will apply to legislation proposed for the 1998 Convention. This change will ensure that all aspects of the division's new structure will be in operation by next year's

Convention.

On behalf of the Commission, Council and transition team, I urge your support of Proposal No. 51.

Gladys Styles Johnston (University of Nebraska at Kearney): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 51. The Commission supports this technical change to the effective date for the new sponsorship requirement for Division II legislation. This change is necessary to make next year's Convention operate under the enhanced legislative requirements that the Division II membership approved last year. For these reasons, the Commission urges your support of Proposal No. 51.

[Proposal No. 51 (Page A-113) was adopted, 233-2-2.]

Division II Membership Requirements—Philosophy Statement

Ms. Johnston: On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Commission and Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 52.

During the transition period to our new governance structure, it became apparent that revisions to the current Division II philosophy statements were necessary. Proposal No. 52 will revise the Division II philosophy statement through edits and also subtraction of A, B, C, E and F.

The Commission and Council believe that this revised statement better reflects the philosophy of Division II institutions regarding their role in intercollegiate athletics. For these reasons, the Commission and the Council urge your support for Proposal No. 52.

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): On behalf of the Division II Management Council Transition Team, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 52.

I was a member of the original Division II restructuring task force that began the new and current Division II philosophy statement approximately 18 months ago. That task force made the recommendations that were set forth in Proposal No. 52 and believes these changes were necessary to more closely reflect the philosophy shared by the current Division II membership. The Management Council Transition Team believes that all proposed revisions are consistent with the principles and changes approved by the Division II membership at last year's Convention when it overwhelmingly supported restructuring legislation. For these reasons, the Management Council Transition Team urges your support of Proposal No. 52.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-115) was adopted, 234-3-42.]

Membership Reclassification— Notification and Championships Eligibility

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1994 Convention, the Division II membership adopted legislation that petitioned an institution from participating in Division II national championships if the institution has formally positioned to reclassify its entire sports program from Division II to Division I. The Division II membership was attempting to address concerns regarding the competitive advan-

tage gained by Division II schools during the two-year reclassification period.

Now it appears necessary to take this same action for Division II institutions that petition to reclassify a single sport from Division II to Division I while maintaining active Division II membership in other sports. This legislation would exclude such institutions from participating in Division II national championships in the affected sport during the reclassification period.

The Council believes this proposal will assist in leveling the playing field in certain Division II sports when movement from Division II to Division I takes place. The Council urges your support for Proposal No. 52.

[Proposal No. 53 (Page A-116) was adopted, 227-9-3.]

Membership Requirements—Provisional Membership

Diane L. Reinhard (Clarion University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

The establishment of an additional year of provisional membership will assist the Association's educational efforts relating to its provisional members in all three divisions. This legislation will increase the length of the provisional membership period from three to four years and specify that this new year will be an additional educational year during which the institution shall apply NCAA legislation to the greatest extent possible.

In Division II, the chief executive officers have agreed to commit time and resources to strengthen the division's compliance and educational services, which include a comprehensive program for Division II provisional members. This extension of the provisional membership period is a necessary first step toward these goals. For these reasons, the Commission and the Council urge your support for Proposal No. 55.

[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-118) was adopted, 227-11-2.]

Division II Membership Requirements—Provisional Membership

Adam W. Herbert (University of North Florida): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation is also very important. It requires new Division II provisional members to complete a comprehensive educational assessment program throughout the four-year provisional membership period. The Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Team are currently developing a process with which all of these Division II provisional members will be able to thoroughly assess both their commitment, compliance and preparedness to join the NCAA.

We believe that this process also will assure each of us as active members of Division II that all provisional institutions have fulfilled each of the membership requirements that our institutions are expected to meet prior to becoming active members. The Presidents Commission urges your support of Proposal No. 56.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-121) was adopted, 230-6-2.]

Resolution: Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics— Division II Eligibility

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move Proposal No. 150.

[The motion was seconded.]

As this resolution indicates, there is an interest among our membership in ensuring that competition in Division II is fair and equitable and that more experienced athletes are not given an unfair competitive advantage over other student-athletes. We believe that this issue should be carefully studied in order to determine exactly what the nature of the issue is in Division II and what the alternatives are for addressing the issue.

This resolution calls for a project team to be appointed to include chief executive officers, athletics administrators, faculty athletics reps and student-athletes to develop appropriate legislation for consideration at next year's Convention.

This issue is an important one for Division II. I urge you to adopt this resolution. Thank you.

Allen Lee Sessoms (Queens College, New York): On behalf of the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission and Division II Presidents Council Transition Team, I encourage you to adopt this resolution. The issue of assuring to the greatest extent possible fair and balanced competition among Division II student-athletes deserves thorough study so that we can get a better understanding of what the issue is and develop a solution to whatever problems exist. I urge your support for this resolution.

F. Paul Bogan (Northeast-10 Conference): I have a question on any resolution. Who pays the freight for the resolution? Does Division II or will the NCAA?

Ms. Dorn: Because it is a project team, which means it's going to be in the format of continued service that the Association guaranteed Division II, it will be an Association-wide budgetary item. Thank you, Paul.

[Resolution No. 150 (Page A-236) was adopted.]

Weekly Hour Limitations—Skill Instruction— Division II Sports Other Than Football

Jane Meier (Northern Kentucky University): I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

The original concept and proposal came before this body more than five years ago. Our women's basketball coach serving as the chair of the WBCA Division II legislative committee was the original author of this legislation. As a coach, she was frustrated that there was never enough time during team practices to work with players in a one-on-one teaching environment.

This proposal is not asking for more time nor more contact between a coach and student-athlete. It is asking for a different use of time at the request of the student-athlete. I urge you to support Proposal No. 74.

Stormie Lynn Wells (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Northern Colorado): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports the adoption of Proposal No. 74. The committee has received correspondence from various student-athlete advisory committees from across the nation requesting endorsement of this proposal. The members of the committee urge adoption for the following compelling reasons: Currently, the student-athletes in question do not have the opportunity for individual skill instruction involving their coach outside the playing season. Individual skill instruction would provide valuable experience that would ultimately help the individual athlete improve and help the team improve.

Secondly, this practice is currently in place in Division I and generally is

looked upon favorably by student-athletes. Finally, and most importantly, the time spent in athletically related activities outside the playing season does not change, the type of activity changes. While some might feel that this legislation places an undue burden on coaches, trainers and administrators, this action is voluntary for all involved.

As Mr. Dempsey said, we are here for the student-athletes. The student-athletes welcome the opportunity to improve their skills through individual teaching. We urge the adoption of Proposal No. 74.

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): At some Division II institutions, part-time coaches are hired to pose as full-time coaches, which results in an institution without full-time coaches being at a disadvantage. This could affect what we are here about—to level the playing field.

Also, manipulation of this rule could allow for abuses. For instance, who initiates the perceived need for special instruction? This is not policeable and thus may allow coaches to put pressure on student-athletes who work part-time during the season. Students living off campus may not have the same opportunities available to students living on campus, therefore I speak against the motion.

Robert A. Barrett (Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne): I was a member of the Legislative Review Committee for the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association. In preparing, I was fortunate to have a member of the Legislative Review Committee of the Women's Basketball Coaches Association call me and urge that I support this.

In the process of conversations, it became very clear that this is a basketball issue. She said that it was the number one issue in the WBCA. I then asked a question from the perspective of cost containment. If a university has a full-time baseball coach and another university has a part-time coach who only shows up during the baseball season, who has the advantage? Everybody knows. I asked her for her solution. Her solution was and I quote, "You'd better get out and hire a full-time coach."

For many of our institutions, I think in our nonrevenue sports, this is going to be prohibitive and is going to put us behind the eight ball. I would urge that we defeat this, bring it back next year as a basketball-only issue. Thank you.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): Those of us who have coached know very well that eventually the voluntary aspects of this will fade and this will become required. I think it would be a nightmare for an athletics director and a compliance officer to sort out when the student really is requesting this time with the coach and when the coach is really expecting this student to show up. Anyone who has coached knows what's going to happen here. I'm reminded of what Cedric Dempsey said last night about loving the baby and not worrying so much about the crib. And I'd like to worry less about the benefits to the basketball coaches and worry more about the excessive time demands on student-athletes. I urge defeat of 74.

Adam W. Herbert (University of North Florida): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and Division II Presidents Council, I would like to advise the membership of a change in our position on this legislation.

After a very thorough discussion of the issue with Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee members and reviewing a report on the experiences that Division I has had in implementing this policy, the Commission, on the recommendation of the Division II subcommittee, has changed its

recommendation from opposition to no position.

Ms. Wells: I would like to respond to some of those replies to what I had said. On the time-demand issue, the time does not increase. The time demand on a student-athlete does not increase. It's the type of activity during that time. I'd like to emphasize that.

I also don't feel it's a basketball issue. I'm a volleyball athlete. I just thought I would throw that out there. It's not simply a basketball issue. The compliance seems to work in Division I. I don't understand how compliance in Division II is that different from Division I. Also, the activity is voluntary on the part of coaches and athletes. The coaches don't have to show up if they don't want to. If the student and coach can't come to an agreement, the coach is voluntarily there also.

The student-athlete can't require the coach to spend that extra time. It's just a request. It's just an opportunity to get individual skilled instruction.

Edward P. Markey (St. Michael's College): I would remind the group that both Division I and Division III have this legislation already. To add support to our position, I would bring to your attention the fact that these coaches are teachers and in their desire to help these young athletes, they certainly should have the opportunity to do so when a student-athlete asks for that kind of assistance. I would also bring it to your attention that many of our part-time coaches are not averse to working with student-athletes, regardless of their part-time position. I would urge your support of this legislation. Thank you.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I believe the eight-hour rule is still in effect, even if you adopt this two-hour issue. So it's covered within that. You aren't adding additional time. Isn't that correct? I'll call the question.

Ms. Dorn: That is correct. The question has been called. We had someone at the microphone when the question had been called so I need to go to microphone number one, please.

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): This is not a level-playing-field issue. This is a student-welfare issue. For the last several years, we've talked about student welfare. Our students have come to us and asked us to make an adjustment. Let's start listening to our students and vote yes. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 74 (Page A-145) was adopted, 147-88-7.]

Ms. Dorn: I have 11 o'clock. If you would please be so kind as to return in about 10 minutes, we will begin a discussion and get your input on the financial aid project team.

[The business session was recessed for 10 minutes.]

DISCUSSION

Ms. Dorn: We are now ready to begin the first of our four presentations in discussions relating to Division II transition topics.

The Management Council Transition Team felt it would be best if we would compile issues that were concerns to the membership and establish project teams. The purpose of the project teams would be to receive input, to receive your participation, to listen to your concerns and begin to formulate policies on behalf of the membership. The purpose of this morning's forum is not to debate the substance, but rather, to hear the direction in which the project teams are moving. We invite your participation. We invite your suggestions, but want to assure you that after the Convention, there will be more oppor-

tunities to complete surveys, to be actively involved in regional seminars and to provide additional input. This morning's first presentation is going to be presented to you by Karen Miller, who is obviously very familiar to all of us as a former Division II Steering Committee and Council member. Karen Miller, athletics director at Cal Poly Pomona and chair of the Division II financial aid project team. Karen.

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): Thank you, Lynn. Greetings from the special project team on financial aid. As we have mentioned to you, we wanted to provide an opportunity for the membership for more input. I think you recognize the fact that we have put several things in your hands already asking for input. We're going to do even more today.

At this time, it's my pleasure to introduce to you the rest of our team. Bob Burke, American International College; Jean Cerra, dean and athletics director at Barry University; Bob Heiny, faculty athletics rep, University of Northern Colorado; Pat Merrier, interim athletics director, University of Minnesota, Duluth; Kurt Patberg, commissioner, Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference; Christ Petrouleas, compliance coordinator, Wayne State; Wil Shaw, faculty athletic rep, Morehouse College; Marge Trout, women's athletics director, Millersville; and Jim Watson, athletics director, West Liberty State. I'd like to share our appreciation to the staff members from the NCAA for their support. We could not proceed through all that we have done without their help and the support and direction that we have received from Lynn Dorn.

This committee was formed due to the passage of Proposal No. 29 from the 1996 Convention. The charge of the committee was to review alternative financial aid models and report back to this Convention. Well, here we are.

After many months of discussion and surveys, we are here to visit with you, share our thoughts and ask for further input from you, the membership. It's very important that we understand what you want us to do. Our time line has been somewhat short, but very full. In May, the Division II group received a survey. It had a number of items on it that covered all sorts of aspects of Division II intercollegiate athletics. A portion of that survey did have something regarding our financial aid materials. The membership responded very, very well, and from that basis we began our discussions.

In August, we had our first in-person meeting. During that time we noted that 60 percent of the membership shows interest in alternative financial aid models. In addition, we attempted to identify from the input on that survey the potential outcomes of the various models suggested. The team also discussed the traditional information we needed and agreed that we needed to collect more information. Thus, we had a survey sent again to you requesting information on equivalencies from each institution as to what was offered.

At the completion of that survey, we were somewhat surprised to find that there was a great deal of discrepancy from what is allowed and what is actually being given. During the next meetings, we ascertained even more information from that and through our discussions—and believe you me, we've had some really good discussions. I think we have such a wide range of thoughts on this committee that we're hoping that we are representing all of you with every possible aspect.

At our October meeting, we discussed further the potential outcome of the

models that had been identified and provided a status report that was sent to you.

During our meeting today, there are several things that we would like to include in the discussion to bring you up-to-date in where we are and try to put everything on an even playing field so we can make clear-cut decisions on the direction of this committee. We will have presentations and clarification on each one of the surveys. Secondly, we will review all four alternative models and the potential outcomes. The third thing will be the explanation of our survey instrument that was provided this morning. You need not fill that information out here today. It is one that has been sent to your institution through your CEO. We ask that it be done as a unit including everyone on your campus, signed by the CEO and then returned to us.

We hope from all this that we can further ascertain a better understanding, reach common ground and get more direction as to the next step for the special projects committee. Now, let's begin the process. We'll do that with Kurt Patberg.

Kurt L. Patberg (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): My portion of this presentation will be very brief. Written in the spring of '96 and finalized in June of '96, the original survey that was sent to the Division II membership dealt with various facets of Division II. Financial aid issues were included in that survey. That survey had an 80-percent participation rate, 200 out of 246 of the membership participated.

As you can see, overwhelmingly in Division II, the membership wanted to consider alternative financial aid models—62 percent of the membership. This particular survey was sent to CEOs. Not all CEOs filled out the survey. Some passed them on to other people on their campus. As you can tell, the majority of the people who filled out the surveys were athletics directors. I don't want to go through each individual figure. It's there for your review. I don't think in reviewing that there are any startling facts.

Please let us know if we're moving too quickly through this material. I don't think there is going to be any surprises. The smaller institutions—the schools under 2,793 students—had more of an interest in looking at alternative models than the larger schools, although the percentile difference is not great.

You'll notice that overwhelmingly in Division II, schools with football wanted alternative models to financial aid. That should not come as any surprise. I was quite alarmed by how high the 73.5 figure was or the 83 schools saying "yes" to looking at alternative models. In the private/public breakdown, 68 percent of the people who said "yes" were private institutions; 59 percent of the people who said "yes" were from public, and obviously the breakdown of those runs along the same consistency factor.

I have one other thing I'd like to go over that is not on one of the slides—the average ranking one through five, one being the highest, five being the lowest of alternative models. You have to understand that at the time this survey was conducted, there was very little detail about the alternative models, so this was very much a preliminary type of answer to the survey. At that time, the need-based financial aid system was being considered the highest at 1.81. Don't get alarmed by these figures. These are very early in the process. That was on need-based financial aid at 1.81.

The second most highly considered alternative model was to revise the current one. That received 2.68. The third was the two-divisional format in football as 3.08. The fourth was to subdivide all team sports in Division II

at 3.14. The last of the five was the other category. We actually did receive a lot of good comments from the membership of Division II that helped this project team get started. The next person on the agenda is Bob Heiny. Bob has probably been dealing with financial aid issues as long as anybody up here. He's been a very valuable member of our team and he's arguably the best golfer sitting in this room.

Robert L. Heiny (University of Northern Colorado): Good morning. We're going to talk a little bit about the survey that we sent out to the athletics directors in early September. We're going to talk a little bit about means, medians and frequency distributions, but rest assured, the committee has told me I can't give you a conclusion of this, there will be no cause for concern.

In September, we sent out a survey asking for all athletics directors in Division II to give us the number of equivalencies they used for the sports that each school sponsors for the 1995-96 year. In that survey, we requested that the schools give us an idea of whether they would be in favor of increasing, decreasing or leaving unchanged the various sports equivalencies. It's difficult to see, but what I have up here is a summary sheet that we sent out for the survey to all institutions. I think all CEOs, athletics directors, senior women administrators and faculty reps were given a copy of this so I would encourage you to take a look at it. These were the results we received. What you see currently on the screen is a summary of the women's sports. For example, the third line you see, basketball, the sports limit is 10. We had approximately 65 percent of the institutions responding with a 7.5 equivalency. Then over on the right-hand side, you'll see an increase of 11 percent. Eleven percent of those responding in women's basketball indicated that they would like to increase the sports limit. Eight percent indicated they'd like to decrease and 80 percent said they'd like no change. In the extreme right-hand column is the number of institutions that responded for that particular sport.

In that packet of information you received is a summary of results we received for all men's and women's sports. Also included in that packet of information was a summary sheet for all men's and women's sports, a summary of the current equivalency limit, the mean of those responding and we also included for your information a median.

Although there are not large differences between them, I think the median is a little more valuable in terms of the summary measure. But you will see in many instances if you examine your packet when you go back to your campus that there were some large discrepancies in the number of equivalencies offered by our Division II institutions in sports. You can see that the equivalency for men's basketball is 10, the average was 8.023 and median would be 8.85. The reason for that is that there is a fairly substantial number of institutions that for whatever reason give no athletics aid or a very small amount of accountable aid. When you have a little bubble down there at the bottom, it tends to drag your mean down. So the median may be a little more accurate representation since we have 50 percent above, 50 percent below. It's something you want to take a look at. Also included in that packet was a frequency distribution of the actual responses by sport. I have two that I wanted to mention to you. Men's football, the current equivalency limit is 36. You'll see in here that of 187 institutions responding, only 101 sponsored football. You'll see that it was sort of dichotomous in the sense that you had 11 schools that offer three or fewer scholarships in football and

you have a bubble at the other end where you have 10 between 30, 33, and 31 institutions between 33 and 36. Over on the extreme right-hand side, we gave you a percentage of those institutions that actually sponsored the sport and responded. So when you see the 30.7 down here, that represents the number or the percentage of those institutions that have football and responded to this survey.

So we have those for each of the men's and each of the women's sports. I think it gives you a pretty good idea of how Division II institutions across the country and across sports either support or don't support with accountable aid those various sports. So we would encourage you to take a look at that. The last one is women's volleyball. You can see in this particular case that it's a fairly even distribution range being from zero all the way up to the sports limit of eight. Also, in this frequency distribution, even though the sports limit, for example, in men's basketball is 10, you'll see one or two institutions reported that they have had over 10. Those are due to two different things. We have some provisional members who are in the process of getting in compliance with Division II. We also have a couple of institutions that are in the process of moving up in Division I that are currently classified as Division II that responded with their current situations. So, we're not indicating there is any need for any self-reports. There are a couple of extenuating circumstances for those.

Before you fill out the survey that your CEO should be receiving this week, look at these equivalency limits and the summaries that we've developed based on this survey taken back in September. We're going to ask the question again based on this new information about what your view would be in terms of increase, decrease or to leave the sports equivalency limit the same.

Thank you. The next person we have is Wil Shaw who is going to give you an introduction into the various financial aid models.

Wil G. Shaw (Morehouse College): Good morning. It is my distinct privilege to introduce to you those persons and the concepts that they will be discussing with you.

First, the football subdivision concept will be presented by Bob Burke. The tuition, fees and books athletics scholarship concept by Jean Cerra; the adjustments of equivalency concept, Marge Trout; and the no-change concept, Jim Watson. They will come before you in that order to present those concepts.

Robert E. Burke (American International College): One of the models under consideration for the project team is a two-tiered system for football. The system is patterned after what already exists in Division I-A and I-AA. It would split Division II into two tiers—Division II and II-AA. These subdivisions of football could be based on levels of financial aid funding by the membership or some other system of limiting financial aid. Division II-AA would be funded at a lesser level than Division II. For example, we currently allow 36 equivalencies in Division II. If the membership decided to split football, a number like 24 equivalencies could be used for Division II-AA.

The membership might also want to take a look at numbers that more closely reflect the actual amount of financial aid that is being issued. For example, Division II could limit its number of equivalencies to a number—say 30—and Division II-AA could limit its equivalency to a number—say 15—or maybe even to need-based aid for Division II-AA. At any rate, this would establish two NCAA championships in football based on criteria established by the membership—that will enable like institutions to compete for

a national championship at the two levels. Any such changes of bracket sizing of course would necessitate the approval of the championships committee. We have some factors that may affect this concept. By creating two subdivisions in football, the net effect may be an increase in the number of playoff spots. We would hope that this would occur if the membership decided to split football. It could reduce the costs associated with sponsoring football for some Division II institutions. You could decide to be in Division II or II-AA. It could also create parity among Division II institutions that currently sponsor football. If the current number of playoff spots is retained, they would have to be divided among the two subdivisions. I think this would be a major negative to that concept.

This also may allow institutions to retain football for purposes of enrollment enhancement and may increase participation opportunities for some student-athletes. There are certainly several negatives involved. It may have a very negative impact on conference membership, given the fact that some schools and conferences fund at the heavy end and some are funding at a meager level. This also may be limited by geographical location with certain institutions and may provide little savings if institutions have to travel greater distances to compete against institutions within their own subdivisions. There is a concern that this could affect the basic makeup of the conferences as we see them today.

Objective factors also have not yet been determined that can be used to equitably divide football along financial aid lines, so a lot more study would need to go into the exact numbers that we're currently using. I think one of the most important is that if football were divided with two subdivisions, other sports may also want the opportunity to subdivide. I think that would negatively impact the concept of the two subdivisions in football.

Next Jean Cerra is going to present on the tuition and fee structure concept. Jean.

G. Jean Cerra (Barry University): I have put together a little overhead here that will clarify some of the limitations of this particular model. Basically, in a tuition, fees and books only model, the cost of an athletics grant-in-aid would be limited to all or a portion of tuition, fees and books. It would not be the equivalent value of tuition, fees and books, which could then be applied to some other area. That is not the case and we want to make sure that everyone understands that. Also, the cost of any institutional nonneed-based scholarship would also be limited to all or a portion of tuition, fees and books only.

I'll go through each of the bullet points that you have been presented with. The buff-colored sheet is probably a little easier to look at than the overhead. If you'll follow along with me, I'm going to try to clarify some of the possible implications of this particular model.

Now that we all have a clearer picture of the limitations surrounding an athletics scholarship in this particular financial aid model, I will try to clarify some of the advantages and disadvantages that the financial aid project team has identified.

The first one: The advantages and disadvantages of this model will change depending on the equivalency level currently being awarded either by sport or by institution. Our survey results tell us that most institutions do not award in each sport the maximum equivalencies permitted under NCAA scholarship limits; therefore, only those institutions currently awarding athletics scholarships with a composite total greater than the value of tuition,

fees and books will realize a cost savings from this model. Should this be the case, the question then becomes: Will this net gain really materialize into a cost savings or will these funds be reallocated on other underfunded areas of the athletics budget?

The second point: The advantages and disadvantages change depending on whether an institution has a high or a low tuition cost. In other words, the current concerns that exist in the present athletics scholarship format—that is, the so-called “public versus private” institution disparity—would remain unresolved since tuition would still remain in the athletics scholarship portion of the formula for this proposed model and that, of course, is where we find the greatest cost difference among our institutions.

The portion remaining, room and board, is the need-based portion, and that does not usually vary significantly from institution to institution. Therefore, institutions with a lower cost of tuition may possibly gain a greater benefit if scholarship dollars are actually saved in this model and these dollars are diverted to fund athletics grants in other sports that are currently underfunded. This is because the comparable room and board dollars saved would stretch further when covering new athletics grant-in-aid involving a low cost of tuition versus a high cost of tuition.

The third point: A lack of consistency may be created among institutions regarding determination of financial need. The question here is: Will institutions be permitted to define and establish their own need-based aid definitions and awards or will need be defined by federal qualifying standards? If need becomes institutionally based, then there could be a wide range of financial aid awards from institution to institution limiting need-based awards to federal limits and/or federal subsidies with qualifying standards that are the same from institution to institution that would serve to equalize this part of the award and eliminate arbitrary definitions established by individual institutions. Another possible solution could be the establishment of a need-analysis processing center to calculate need and family contribution for each student-athlete, as recommended by the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism in its 1995 report.

The next point: The model could have the effect of diminishing the success of recruiting academically sound students who do not qualify for need-based aid. Since most academic scholarships are earmarked toward tuition, the academically superior student who has no verifiable need could actually realize less total aid under this system. In addition, success in recruiting these students could be hampered when Division I and Division III institutions are able to create award packages that exceed the value of tuition, fees and books.

One of the questions that would still need to be clarified is whether the current exemption for honorary academic awards will remain in the accountable aid calculation. The answer to this question could have the effect of diminishing the negative effect or increasing the negative effect on recruiting academically sound student-athletes who do not qualify for need-based aid.

Next point: Division II institutions may be at a disadvantage in recruiting blue-chip student-athletes. Many Division II institutions can now compete very successfully for these athletes against Division I institutions through the full scholarship option. Since this proposed model would basically eliminate this option or render the need-based portion unknown at the time of recruitment, it is possible that Division II institutions could be restrict-

ed in building an attractive enough financial aid package that would allow them to compete for blue-chip athletes or any athlete, for that matter, also being sought by both Division I and Division III institutions.

Next point: This model could result in less total aid, even for full-need students. If the need-based portion of the award is defined by federal qualifying standards only, then it is possible that a student receiving the full amount of available federal aid could end up with less than the amount needed to cover room and board costs and therefore receive considerably less than what is now permitted under the currently allowed \$1,500 Pell subsidy above a full grant-in-aid. If, on the other hand, institutions are permitted to set up their own need-based awards, then this proposal could indeed result in a full-need student receiving a greater amount than currently permitted assuming, however, that the cost of attendance at that particular institution is greater than \$1,500 beyond a full grant-in-aid. Next point: This model will disadvantage the recruited student-athlete without financial need. A few possibilities become evident here. One, the student-athlete could be disadvantaged over other students on campus. Any other student receiving a talent scholarship at a given institution, for example, music, dance, art, debate, may not be restricted to a tuition, fees and books only award at the exclusion of all other institutional aid. Another scenario could be that coaches may prefer to focus their attention on those prospects with a higher verifiable need because they will be able to build a more financially attractive scholarship package. In another scenario, athletics or institutional award amounts among student-athletes on a given team could actually be less for more talented players—in other words, starters versus nonstarters—if the starter has no verifiable need.

Also, sports that traditionally have a greater percentage of student-athletes who do not need to calculate the need, may be more adversely affected by the proposal by possibly having to incur greater out-of-pocket costs. The middle-income student-athlete who just missed the qualification for need-based aid may also have to incur greater out-of-pocket costs. This assumes that the institution, of course, is currently awarding to this student-athlete nonathletically based institutional nonneed based aid beyond the value of tuition, fees and books. Thank you for your attention.

Marge Trout will now take over and she'll talk to you about the adjustment of equivalencies concept. Marge.

Marjorie A. Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): Thank you. Looking at the equivalencies is nothing new to us. We think back over the last four or five years. We have done some adjustments, but what we'd like to do today, is just look at what we have studied and fill you in. I also have larger slides. I have bifocals, you might be able to see my slides a little easier.

It's either increase or decrease the current Division II maximum equivalencies limits in men's and women's sports. What are the advantages and disadvantages? Number one, it could give Division II an opportunity to review our current equivalencies and see if they are meeting our needs. Two, increase in the current equivalencies in some sports will assist institutions in remaining competitive in recruiting the quality student-athletes. Third, decreasing the current equivalencies may result in cost savings or reallocation of the dollars for some institutions. Changes to the current system by adjusting the equivalencies will be the least disruptive to the membership application of its current financial aid model.

Changes in equivalencies limits could continue to provide institutions with more flexibility and control over their athletics budgets when compared to changes suggested in other possible models. If a sport is fully funded, decreases in current equivalency limits could reduce the opportunities for a student-athlete. An increase in current equivalency limits would increase costs for an institution.

I would like to now refer to the information that was sent to athletics directors that asked them to identify their equivalencies on their own campuses. This was sent in August. We've already referred to the institutions that responded—187 of 289 institutions responded, which represents 65 percent; 161 of the 246 or 66 percent of our active members responded; 26 of the 43 or 60 percent of the provisional members responded; and the committee certainly did appreciate those of you who did respond. I would like to take a moment to look at the chart. The equivalencies permitted are in the left-hand column, along with the number of institutions that responded to us, the mean and the median. I'm not going to go over the numbers for you. I think you can see there are many institutions that responded that are not even getting close to the equivalencies that are allowed. I think the median certainly does tell us where we are as far as the middle of the road with these equivalencies. In the women's programs, the new sports have been added. When you look at it, you see for an example synchronized swimming has five equivalencies and is 4.9. But I think that you have to look at how many institutions responded. This information will be in the packet. In the men's programs, we have the same equivalencies—the number of institutions that responded and that sponsored that sport, the average, and the mean. Again, if I would have them side-by-side, you could see that basketball was very close to fulfilling the full equivalencies in both the men's and women's sports. It was closer than any of the other sports.

Again, let me stress the importance of filling out the survey so we have information about your individual equivalencies. Thank you.

Now, I will introduce Jim who will say let's stay where we are.

James W. Watson (West Liberty State College): Thank you, Marge.

I have the task of explaining to you what "no change" means. In today's jargon, that's called a "no-brainer."

We've all lived with this system for quite some time now and it appears that the membership may have come full circle in the sense that the survey conducted last June indicated a strong desire for change. Then when we began to look at the various scenarios that would potentially develop as a result of these new models, there seemed to be some gravitation back to the current model as we now know it. I think the committee feels that the members have for the most part developed a sense of comfort with the current system because it does provide institutions with flexibility and control over their individual athletics budgets.

The current system would give Division II additional time to review related issues in the areas of membership requirements, championships and enhancement-fund distribution. As you know, those are in a state of flux as we move into the federated divisions. The comfort level with the current rules and the ease of their application appears to be acceptable to most of the membership at this time. Current legislation allows room for cost savings since many institutions are below the current level. Current competition opportunity will not be interrupted and the current financial aid model allows Division II programs to compete for quality student-athletes.

There is a perceived protection on the part of the membership. We believe Division II student-athlete welfare will be protected by the status quo. The survey results indicate that many Division II institutions are certainly well below the maximum levels. That is an understatement. As you review the survey that Marge presented, you will see that other than in the sports of men's and women's basketball and the elite football schools, the current caps appear to be on a long leash, if you will, that are not approached by many of us. There are also clear inconsistencies on how various institutions determine accountable aid, which might require the formulation of something like another clearinghouse, which I'm sure would be an interesting topic for another day.

At this time, I would like to introduce Pat Merrier, who will talk about the survey instrument. Thank you.

Pat A. Merrier (University of Minnesota, Duluth): Hi folks. As you've heard this presentation, you've had a chance to retrace with us the path we've taken in gathering information from you. You've also had an opportunity to hear about what I'll call the "present," and that's our thinking about the pluses and minuses, the advantages and disadvantages, of each of the concepts that now stand before you.

I'm here to ask for your help in the future; specifically, for your help in filling out one more survey. Last week, mailed to the chief executive officer of each of your institutions, was a six-part survey asking for some demographic information about your institution, some general information about the financial aid idea as a whole, and most specifically, information about your attitude and opinions toward each of the four concept models we've presented today. In each case, we'll ask for your opinions. In each case, we'll ask whether you wish us to continue to pursue that particular model. And in each case, we invite your comments. We want to accomplish a number of things, but most specifically, we want to get your guidance on whether we should continue to pursue and ultimately develop legislation related to all four models so that at next year's Convention we may focus more clearly.

We also want your help in deciding what it is in each one of these areas we should be narrowing our focus toward. Surveys should be arriving on your campus soon, if they have not already been delivered. The surveys require the signature of the CEO. They are not due back to the NCAA until February 7, so you've got some time for thought. You've got some time for dialogue.

We will now move on for an opportunity to discuss what we've presented today. You may have questions about the surveys. You may have questions about the advantages and disadvantages. You may just have general comments to make about the entire concept of alternative financial aid models.

We thank you for your past support. We encourage your continued support. As several of the presenters have noted, response to earlier surveys has been excellent. The research staff at the NCAA has been very pleased and assures us that we can take a look at the results of these surveys with confidence that they represent the range of responses within our division. We expect that you will thoroughly respond again and in a timely fashion. Thank you.

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): At this time, we welcome your comments.

Peter Chapman (Wayne State College, Nebraska): I expressed to several members of the committee that when you are collecting that data—espe-

cially on equivalencies—it's really hard to know how exactly to put down the squad lists. It seems to me that on some of those questions, it would have been better to ask how many equivalencies your institution can allow. Let's take the sport of basketball. Our squad list was at 8.5 or something like that. Institutionally, we allow 10 scholarships in men's and women's basketball. But we didn't use all 10 for that particular year due to a lot of different things. At the end of the year, that was our equivalency. The coach decided not to award a scholarship that year or a kid quit and that's the end result of it. It kind of affects that statistical analysis at the end. It just seems to me that if you start talking about lowering equivalencies based on that information, you need to take into consideration the things that affect the equivalencies, not just what you are offering. I didn't know if I made that clear.

Ms. Miller: I understand what you are saying, but oftentimes we allocate to the sport a certain amount of money, but not all the time it is used. That's what you reported. You reported the equivalencies for that time period.

Mr. Chapman: Right.

Ms. Miller: Let us think about that for a moment and we'll go to another question. Maybe we need to add on the survey another column that indicates what you have available but did not award. We have asked in the new survey what is being awarded. Before the end of this session, we'll make a decision. Thank you very much for your input.

Thomas R. Wistrick (Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference): I have a policy question based on the two subdivisions in football. The first thing I see is an increase in the number of playoff spots. If that occurred, where would that money come from and how would it be determined? If the money came from the surplus fund that will exist in Division II, who would determine where that came from and what's the policy to that effect?

Ms. Miller: I believe the dollars will come from within Division II, what we have and what we will be working with now. The determination will be made by the membership from the suggestions that we received in this survey and any other discussions we have on that matter.

Mr. Wistrick: Is it a Championships Committee issue then as far as the size of the bracket?

Ms. Miller: Yes.

Mr. Wistrick: Okay. Thank you.

Jack Rich (Abilene Christian University): Can you give some more rationale under scenario two why you are in essence penalizing the academically more capable students?

Ms. Miller: We just tried to approach this with an open mind and provide potential outcomes. It isn't a position necessarily taken by the committee. We just tried to come up with various thoughts on what would happen. It isn't a "position" if that's what you are asking. Do you want further explanation of that?

None of these models are specific positions. The models presented came from you, the membership. All we are doing is reporting to you what those models are and the potential outcomes from those models. If there are other potential outcomes that you may have, then we would appreciate you sharing them with us.

Kelly J. Higgins (University of Alaska Fairbanks): I'd like to concur with Pete Chapman's statement. We also sent in the form and it is based upon on how many we actually gave. We are allowed 10 in basketball and most sports. In three sports, we are below those maximum equivalency levels that

you have. I just want to concur. I think we do need to have some sort of a format to address that particular issue and not base any particular levels on the response that came in.

Mr. Watson: The current survey that you will be receiving does not ask for information about the level at which you are currently awarding equivalencies. In subsequent surveys, it's quite possible that the committee could include two columns that would reflect what you are actually awarding and what you could be awarding should you choose to fully award. But I don't think that that will cause any difficulty in responding to the survey that you will be receiving shortly, because it does not ask for that specific information.

William R. Trumbo (University of Hawaii at Hilo): Some conferences by rule limit member institutions to certain scholarship limits.

It might be interesting to include in the survey that should there not be limits, what would their institution give or if they would be changing. In the area of the need-based scholarship beyond tuition, fees and books, the individual institutions vary in their abilities to provide the matching part of need-based. Some have endowed funds. It seems to me I didn't hear that discussion as a potential for making more uneven the opportunities for scholarship assistance. Some can provide just out of their own resources all that is needed, whatever configuration is used to determine that need, while others have a very difficult time even at present meeting the need of all students in the full qualification.

Ms. Miller: That's true, Bill. Thank you very much.

Robert E. Burke (American International College): Just a point of information, when the second survey was put together, the committee wanted to get a general idea from the membership on how much actually was being awarded. I don't think anybody needs to get nervous about the fact that in basketball, for example, if you are allowed 10 scholarships and you can give 10 at your institution, that this committee is going to suggest retracting that number to 8.5 or 8.3 because that's all that is being currently awarded.

We felt that the membership ought to have a knowledge of what everybody else out there is spending because that's important for us as athletics directors because we hear so many things from our coaching staffs about what institution X, Y and Z are currently spending. We think this will help you have a better understanding of exactly what's out there.

G. Jean Cerra (Barry University): This pertains to the question about why the academically sound student might be disadvantaged under the need-based model.

The current system actually encourages recruitment of academically sound students, particularly those who qualify for an honorary academic award because those are exempt. So in essence, a student of that ability would not count against your total. It also permits you to be able to go after those students who are not only academically sound but also athletically gifted so that if you have limited athletics scholarship resources at your institution, you can actually recruit that top student and build with fewer athletics dollars, whereas under the need-based model, they would get their academic scholarship, but that's as far as you could go. If it's a full tuition scholarship, you might be able to just give them fees and books but they would not have the opportunity to earn other scholarships available on your campus whether they be leadership scholarships or whatever that exceed the value of tuition, fees and books.

Ms. Miller: Are there any other comments or questions? As you can see within the survey, there are many places for additional comments. If you feel that we haven't asked the right question or provided you with the correct information, please don't hesitate to contact any of us. We encourage you to fill out the survey in consultation with other members from your campus and to remark on other things even if they aren't mentioned. Please submit your thoughts. That's going to give us further direction on what our special projects committee should do.

As you can see, I think we have an excellent committee. They make my job as chair much easier. We look forward to responding to your input in this new survey. Once again, it was mailed December 10. It should be in the hands of your CEO by the time you return. The return date on that is February 7. Thank you very much for your time.

[The Division II business session was recessed for lunch.]

Monday Afternoon, January 13, 1997

The meeting was called to order at 1:45 p.m., with Lynn L. Dorn, presiding.

Ms. Dorn: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to formally begin this afternoon's session.

Charles A. "Tod" Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): Early this morning, we heard a representative from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee voice concern over the role of student-athletes in our new governance structure. Therefore, in light of this, I'd like to request that this role and the rationale for this role be clarified this afternoon for this body. Thank you.

Adam W. Herbert (University of North Florida): First, let me say that the Presidents Council feels very strongly about the importance of seeking student input in our decision-making processes. We have had a very thorough discussion, a very positive one, relative to the importance of involving students in our decision-making processes.

When we began discussing alternative ways of assuring that we could get student input, it seems to me, and some of my colleagues can add to this, but we talked really about three different principles. First of all, we clearly wanted to maximize opportunities for student input, particularly on issues related to policy, to rules and services. We saw those three areas at a minimum as being particularly important.

We also felt very strongly that we did not waste the student's time dealing with issues that were not as directly related to those issues. Finally, we wanted to assure that we did not take them out of classes for unreasonable periods of time. We asked the Management Council to take a look at this issue given those three or four basic principles and to come back to the Presidents Council with some recommendations as to how we might facilitate the overall objective that we had. So essentially, what we have done is the following: Division I and Division III, as you heard this morning, have opted to put two students on their Management Councils. The view of our Management Council was that that's the old way of doing things. It did not speak to the philosophy of what we were concerned about. We wanted much broader-based participation and we wanted much more inclusive participation. Essentially, we have established a student-athletic advisory committee structure. It is a structure that calls for a student advisory committee to be created on every campus within Division II. We're urging our

conferences to also assure that they establish student advisory councils so we're able to deal with issues related to student-athletes at the conference level. Finally, we would have a national organization or committee that would be a student advisory committee. That committee at the national level would also reflect our commitment to focus on conferences as a vehicle for facilitating participation so that every conference would have a student representative. We would have a student representative for independent institutions and we would have two at large to assure diversity.

By doing this, we are attempting to assure that we have representation cutting across all sports that we have within our member institutions, that we're taking into account regions of the country that we're dealing with conferences, and that we're also able to deal with diversity from a gender and equity perspective. We believe that with that kind of national body, we're able to assure there is a broad-based participation that we regard as being essential. It says something else—that two or three people will not be the students who speak alone for all of the students in our many institutions. We feel that this process will enable us to identify problems. It provides opportunities for students to raise issues related to policy, rules and procedures.

The second thing we've established is an annual legislative summit for student-athletes. Essentially, we would invite the students to attend the meeting at the same time the Management Council is meeting to give them an opportunity to review legislative issues and make suggestions as to new legislation or have an opportunity to talk with members of the Management Council. On that occasion and through the input coming to the Presidents Council, we'll be able to once again get their input.

Of course, we will have a number of project teams and committees that will be needed on an ongoing basis. Those committees will have an opportunity to ask for student input from the structure that we've established. We also have ongoing communications between the representatives of the students and the chairs of both the Presidents Council and the Management Council. I would just note in that regard that at this Convention, Division II has been the only division in which student-athlete representatives have met with the chairs of both the Management Council and the Presidents Council. It is the only division where that's occurred. I think that speaks to the kind of philosophy that we're trying to implement throughout the process that we are developing and we intend to continue that process as we go forward.

So if the question is: Is this different from Divisions I and III? Yes, it is. My feeling is we should not sit here and say those divisions are doing it, we ought to. I think we have taken a step forward and have gone beyond what Divisions I and III are doing. I think our athletes are going to have an opportunity to take an active role in what we're doing in this division. I can tell you this, the presidents do not want to deal with all of the nitty-gritty issues that the Management Council is going to be dealing with on an ongoing basis. I don't think it's reasonable for us to expect students to do some things that we clearly don't want to do because they aren't matters most of us deal with. I can tell you by looking at the volume of material that the Management Council deals with, it will take two to three-and-a-half days. If you include travel for students to attend those meetings, you multiply that by four or five. That is unreasonable in terms of asking them to attend that many meetings plus take part in their own activities as members of these various stu-

dent advisory organizations.

We want student involvement. We want direct ongoing involvement. My belief is that this is definitely the way to do it.

I will make one final observation. This is a snapshot in time. All of us recognize that over the course of the next year or two, we're going to look at modifications. If it appears that there is a need for changing the way we are doing it now, we have an opportunity to do that. But I think it is clearly the view of the Management Council and the Presidents Council that what we're doing is going to be much more creative. It's going to be a much more effective way of assuring significantly more student involvement than Division I and Division III will ever have and we're doing it right now.

Ms. Dorn: Thank you very much for the question and President Herbert, thank you very much for the clarification and the rationale established by the Management Council Transition Team in terms of the relationship between the student-athletes. Thank you student-athletes. We do appreciate your input and we do value the relationship. We know together that we'll be moving forward. Thank you.

At this time, we are going to continue voting on the Division II legislative proposals.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Pass-Fail Grades

Pamela L. Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, courses that are graded on a pass-fail basis may not be used to satisfy core curriculum requirements. This proposal would permit the use of individual core courses graded on a pass-fail basis for purposes of satisfying the core-curriculum requirements with the understanding that the clearinghouse will assign the course the lowest passing grade at that high school, which in some instances may be a grade as low as a "D".

This proposal will give students an opportunity to use courses to meet initial-eligibility requirements that otherwise meet the definition of a core course but are graded on a pass-fail basis. Further, the requirement that the clearinghouse will assign the lowest passing grade will ensure that such courses will not be used to circumvent the minimum core curriculum grade-point average standards. The Academic Requirements Committee urges your support and requests that you vote in favor of Proposal 90.

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A-161) was adopted.]

Initial Eligibility—Core-Curriculum Requirements— Students with Disabilities.

Mary Lisko (Augusta State University): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal verifies that the Academic Requirements Committee, as opposed to the high-school principal, has final authority to determine whether high-school courses for students with disabilities are core courses.

Over the next several months, high schools will be asked to provide information on a worksheet about courses that are offered for students with disabilities. The worksheets ask the high schools to state whether students enrolled in such courses are expected to require the same knowledge, quan-

titatively and qualitatively, as students in similar courses offered by the high school. The worksheet also asks the high school to provide information on the tests used and the specific accommodations made that differentiate between these courses and the courses taken by students without disabilities.

This proposal clarifies that while the high-school principal will be asked to provide the required documentation, it is the Academic Requirements Committee that ultimately makes the final determination as to whether the course should be accepted as a core course. The Academic Requirements Committee urges your support and requests that you vote for Proposal 91. [Proposal No. 91 (Page A-161) was adopted.]

Initial Eligibility—Early Admissions Program Waiver

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal permits a student to receive an automatic waiver of initial-eligibility requirements if he or she is admitted through an early admission program and has not completed four years of English.

Currently, a student admitted to the early admission program must meet all initial-eligibility requirements except graduation from high school in order to be eligible. This requires a student to complete four years of English in less than four years of high-school enrollment. This issue is a result of a change in the English requirement, which specifies that a student entering the Division I institution must have completed four years of English. The early admission program predates the change in the English standard.

This proposal will ensure that academically gifted students have an opportunity to qualify for an early admission waiver. The committee urges your support and requests that you vote in favor of Proposal No. 93.

[Proposal No. 93 (Page A-163) was adopted.]

Eligibility—Practice Opportunities for Olympics

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal originated from a joint task force of the United States Olympic Committee and the NCAA, cochaired by Ced Dempsey and George Steinbrenner. The proposal extends a new practice opportunity for potential Olympians that was established at last year's Convention.

Currently, a former student-athlete or a student-athlete who is not enrolled on a full-time basis, is permitted in certain sports to participate in practice activities at the institution that the student-athlete previously attended as an undergraduate, subject to certain conditions. Proposal No. 95 would allow such practice opportunity for a former student-athlete at any institution the individual currently attends or previously attended as a graduate student. The Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believe that this proposal represents a goodwill gesture to the Olympic movement and to the United States Olympic Committee without increasing the potential for abuse. I urge you to adopt this legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-165) was adopted.]

Eligibility—Hardship Waiver

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the NCAA Council and Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 142.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is the first in a series of proposals that the Legislative Review Committee recommended to the Council for deregulation or simplification.

In sports that are subject to date-of-competition limitations such as track and field and golf, there exists some confusion as to whether the percentage calculation for purposes of meeting the hardship waiver should be based on completed dates of competition.

Under current NCAA legislation, the phrase "completed events" refers to completed varsity contests in all sports. Thus, in a sport subject to date-of-competition limitations, a student-athlete who participates in three contests on a single day uses one date of competition for purposes of Bylaw 17, but has participated in three completed events for purposes of a hardship waiver in Bylaw 14. Adoption of this proposal would permit the percentage calculation for hardship waivers in those sports that use date of competition to be based on the institution's number of completed dates of competition as opposed to completed varsity events.

The hardship waiver calculation in Bylaw 14 now would be consistent with how dates of competition are calculated in Bylaw 14. We respectfully urge your support.

[Proposal No. 142 (Page A-224) was adopted.]

Exceptions to Outside Competition—Summer Basketball—Division II

F. Paul Bogan (Northeast-10 Conference): On behalf of the Northeast-10 Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal removes the restriction on outside basketball competition that occurs during the summer. It does not change that the league has to be approved by the NCAA or that the individual has to receive permission from the athletics director to play in that league.

In the commissioners' meeting, I heard some of the problems that they said could happen. They said that a coach could have five of his members playing in one area. That is possible. But we know that can happen any time with any of the regulations that we have. If anything, the student-athlete in Division II will have more of an opportunity to develop his skill and to play in a different league, especially if he lives two to three hundreds miles away from the institution. There will be violations because we know those individuals who want to have violations will have them, but it is in the best interests of the student-athlete and the institution.

C. Donald Cook (Sacred Heart University): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 97.

This proposal would eliminate all restrictions related to the involvement of our basketball student-athletes in basketball competition during the summer.

If this proposal would be adopted, there would be no requirement that the athletics director give permission for his or her student-athletes to participate on an outside team during the summer. Further, if this proposal were adopted, there would be no limit on the number of student-athletes in the same Division II school who could compete on the same team during the

summer. The current restrictions help us to ensure that there is nothing happening during the summer that approaches full-fledged practice and also ensures that we know what kinds of basketball teams our student-athletes are involved with during the summer.

The sponsors contend in the rationale statement that the current restriction prevents student-athletes from adequately working on their skills during the summer. On the contrary, with the current restriction, Division II student-athletes are able to work on their skills during the summer but only on a team in a league that has been approved because it has met certain criteria. Eliminating all restrictions on the competition in which our basketball student-athletes are involved during the summer goes a bit too far. I urge the delegates to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

Edward P. Markey (St. Michael's College): I rise in support of this legislation. I bring it to the attention of the gathering that the NABC—the basketball coach's association—supports this legislation. But you should also take into consideration the fact that the Division III rules go into effect; those students are permitted the freedom to participate on their own.

The players should be players as much as they can and we should not restrict it as we have restricted them in the past. The availability to participate should be there. Let's avoid some hypocrisy in this situation whereby the kids are going to play regardless of the advice and the legislation that precludes their participation now. Administrators doing our job is certainly going to help in getting students to participate. We are again restricting the students from doing things that they enjoy doing. We are not talking about the big-time basketball programs. If it's a betting problem, small college games are not in a betting war. They are not concerned about exposing these young people to potential bribery. Players need this type of work and the opportunity to do so should be given to them. Thank you.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): Is this one vote or was it moved in its entirety? I have a concern about that.

Ms. Dorn: Moved in its entirety.

Mr. Fallis: I would ask that we vote on each section separately.

Ms. Dorn: Jim, are you looking to break out A, B, and C separately?

Mr. Fallis: Yes, ma'am.

[The motion to divide the proposal was seconded but failed.]

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): We're supporting this particular proposal because a large number of our student-athletes participating in basketball come from rural communities that just don't have sanctioned, approved leagues, especially our women athletes. They go home to Hoisington or Russell or other places they live in Kansas and are not able to participate in their town leagues and town summer activities because of this regulation. That's why we are supporting it. It's going to bring equity.

Look at where the approved leagues are. They are in larger cities and they don't provide the opportunity for the athletes, especially some of the women athletes in smaller towns.

Mr. Bogan: I just want a little clarification. My good friend, Don Cook, said they didn't have to get approval from the league and the athletes didn't have to get approval. I think they still have to get approval. Am I correct on that, Nancy?

Nancy L. Mitchell (NCAA Staff): Paul, I think we were looking at section A. In section A, you are deleting Division II from that reference and therefore everything in section A would not apply to Division II.

Mr. Bogan: I stand corrected, thank you.
[Proposal No. 97 (Page A-168) was adopted.]

De Minimus Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

Bob V. Brennan (Wayne State University, Michigan): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ms. Dorn: Now we are prepared to vote on the effective date first. All in favor of voting upon the effective date, please raise your paddle. Thank you. All opposed? It passes.

We are now voting on 98-B, -C, -D, -E, -F, -G and -J. You will now speak to the proposal, which will have an immediate effective date.

Mr. Brennan: Thank you. At last year's Convention, the membership adopted legislation that eliminated the responsibility of each institution to declare the student-athlete or prospect ineligible for small, inconsequential types of violations. These types of violations do not result in a benefit being provided to the prospect or student-athlete, and the institutions seldom gain a recruiting advantage.

It is important to note, however, that all violations of NCAA rules, including those included in this proposal must be reported to the NCAA enforcement staff. One or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.1 will continue to be imposed upon the institution and the institutional employee. The only difference is that the eligibility of the student-athletes will not be affected. The Eligibility Committee believes that this proposal is an effective and positive step toward deregulation of de minimus violation that currently affect a prospect or student-athlete's eligibility.

The Eligibility Committee strongly supports this proposal. I urge your support as well.

[Parts B, C, D, E, F, G and J of Proposal No. 98 (Page A-169) were adopted.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Divisions I and II Football

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation would permit one phone call to a prospect during the month of May of the prospect's junior year in high school in the sport of football.

The reasoning behind this is to assess the level of interest in the institution by the student-athlete. It could result in cost reduction from the lack of calls, mail and authorized recruiting trips if the prospect is not interested. This will also eliminate one additional phone call prior to September 1 of the senior year, thus eliminating any calls during the month of August. We would urge your approval of this proposal.

Danielle Tiernan (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Grand Valley State University): I stand before you representing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We are here because we want to express our opposition to Proposal No. 99.

We are in opposition to Proposal No. 99 because we feel it compromises our primary ideals. Those being protecting the welfare of the student-athlete and providing the student-athlete with opportunities. Furthermore,

this is a benefit to the institution, not the student-athlete, our primary concern. At this time in the student-athlete's life, he or she is preparing for final exams and he or she is also preparing to take college entrance exams. We feel this proposal, if passed, would be detrimental to this process.

Finally, current legislation allows for a prospective student-athlete to begin receiving athletics correspondence from institutions at the beginning of his or her junior year. Thus, the student-athlete will have ample time to review the materials and determine where his or her interest lies. We ask you to vote in opposition to Proposal No. 99. Thank you.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): With reference to the student-athlete representative, I believe this is a football-only issue.

I would like to speak in support of this. It really is just a transformation of dates that allows our coaches to truly identify those student-athletes who are legitimately interested in our schools. I think it's a positive piece of legislation rather than a negative piece of legislation.

Ms. Tiernan: I think it's important to remember first and foremost that we're here to represent the student-athletes across the nation. We all know that they consist of males and females. I think that our position reflects what the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes. We also must remember that Todd Henning is also on our committee. He plays Division II football. He wasn't able to be here today. I'm here to represent that side.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-172) was defeated.]

Printed Recruiting Materials—Student-Athlete Handbook— Divisions I and II

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I move Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

If a prospect does not take an official or unofficial visit, the student-athlete handbook is not available to the prospect until he or she travels to the campus for enrollment. To be able to send that information upon signing or upon acceptance of enrollment would enable the prospect and the prospect's parents to become acquainted with the institution's rules, policies and philosophies earlier in the process, which would be beneficial.

These handbooks often contain necessary preenrollment information but by definition cannot be sent. Also, the handbooks often are updated during the summer. This is permissive legislation. Institutions will be permitted to send updated versions.

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): The Recruiting Committee supports this proposal. It is consistent with the general belief that recruiting legislation should be less restrictive after a prospect signs the National Letter of Intent. The committee believes that it is reasonable to permit institutions to send handbooks to the prospects.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-184) was adopted.]

Ms. Dorn: It is now 2:30. At this time, we are going to take about a five-to six-minute break.

[The business session was recessed.]

DISCUSSION

Ms. Dorn: We are ready to continue our floor discussions on important Division II transition topics. Our second topic for the day is to discuss the Division II budget process, financial principle and policy. The individual

chairing this committee is familiar to all of us as former vice-president of Division II, President Tony Ceddia.

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania) Thank you very much, Lynn. The Budget and Finance Subcommittee, ladies and gentlemen, was established by the Division II Presidents Commission last spring. The subcommittee was established to review the division's projected budget allocation, make recommendations regarding the division's budget for the 1997-98 academic year, develop budget guidelines and principles that will ensure Division II operates in a fiscally responsible and financially prudent manner in the new structure, and consider alternative plans to distribute the Division II enhancement fund.

The subcommittee is comprised of representatives of Division II's Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams. The subcommittee has met twice in person and once by telephone conference. The members of the subcommittee—I'd like them to stand as I introduce them—are as follows: Bob Burnett, president, Armstrong State University; Tim Dillon, director of athletics, University of Alaska Anchorage; Lynn Dorn, Division II vice-president and director of women's athletics, North Dakota State University; Carol Dunn, director of athletics, California State University, Los Angeles; Adam Herbert, president, University of North Florida; Jerry Hughes, director of athletics, Central Missouri State University; Marvalene Hughes, president, California State University, Stanislaus; Gladys Styles Johnston, chancellor, University of Nebraska at Kearney; and Don Landry, commissioner of the Sunshine State Conference.

Ladies and gentlemen, during the next 30 minutes, you will hear from the subcommittee members regarding a variety of topics, including Division II budget principles and alternative distribution models for the Division II enhancement fund. Following our presentation, we will have approximately 20 minutes to hear from the membership regarding your comments and questions. Please, at the outset, keep in mind that the information you are reviewing today is preliminary work and will continue to be considered and discussed by the subcommittee during the next several months. Also, membership comments and reactions will not end following today's forum. The subcommittee hopes to survey the membership this spring to provide Division II institutions with an opportunity to react to alternative methods for distributing the Division II enhancement fund.

Before turning the podium over to my subcommittee colleagues, I would like to comment briefly on the division's projected surpluses as a result of its 4.37 percent allocation of the Association's operating budget. Funding projections should be on the first page of your handout. The chart details budget and surplus estimates for Division II for the 1997-98 fiscal year through the 2001 to 2002 fiscal year. Over this five-year period, Division II can anticipate approximately \$11½ million in surplus if the division championship expenses and total amount distributed to the division's enhancement fund formula remain the same.

After this five-year period, Division II also will have over \$3 million in a reserve fund as well. You will hear more about the reserve fund in a few minutes. As you can see by the figures in the chart, Division II's financial picture in the immediate future is bright. I'd like now to introduce Marvalene Hughes, who will present to you the budget guidelines and principles that have been developed by this subcommittee. Marvalene.

Marvalene Hughes (California State University, Stanislaus): Thank you

very much, Tony. It is my privilege to introduce the nine principles that have been advanced by Division II's budget guideline and financial committee.

After the three iterations that have been referenced here, the budget finance committee recommended nine principles to the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council's Transition Team. You may find these principles on page two of your handout. In all distributions, the overall chief concerns were effective championship funding and the institutions involved, assuring sound principles of fund distribution, balancing income and expenses, and building a reserve, assuring budgetary flexibility to promote Division II's philosophy and direction.

The nine principles are as follow: That an institution's expenses for participation in championship rounds in an NCAA Division II championship will be adequately covered and that consistent transportation and per diem guidelines be maintained to the Division II championship. I think emphasis here should be placed on adequate coverage.

That Division II championships will be the top priority in budget discussions that occur and decisions that are made. The words "the top" priority was deliberately chosen rather than "one of the top" priorities. I would like for you to note that emphasis.

That Division II championship policies will reflect an interest in generating Division II championship revenue to the greatest extent possible. This will be consistent with Division II championship principles and guidelines. Further, the Division II championship policies will reflect an overall cost-containment philosophy supporting initiatives such as the regionalization concept and geographical proximity of championship sites. For purposes of these budget principles, cost containment encompasses the efficient and cost-effective operation of Division II championships.

That at a minimum, \$3 million will be distributed annually to Division II institutions via the current Division II enhancement-fund distribution formula or any other formulas that may be adopted.

That the Division II championship committee will be responsible for the mechanisms of distributing the enhancement fund and the distribution policies will be developed by the Division II budget finance committee and ratified by the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council. The budget committee becomes the policy committee and the Division II Championship Committee becomes the mechanism distribution committee.

That at a minimum, five percent of the annual Division II allocations, and at a minimum, five percent of any applicable surpluses from the previous year will be designated for a Division II membership reserve beginning with the 1997-98 fiscal year. That is to initiate the reserve, which may be used for new initiatives or rainy-day activity.

That annual operating surpluses will be designated for the Division II membership reserve and/or a supplemental distribution at the end of the year.

That care will be taken to avoid funding special interests or various segments of the Division II membership or items that may be more of an institution's responsibility than that of the Association.

And, finally, that these budget principles will be reviewed annually by the Presidents Commission and Management Council and modified as necessary to ensure that they are reflective of Division II's philosophy and direction. It is now my pleasure to introduce Tim Dillon.

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): I will be giving you

an overview of the Division II budget cycle in the new structure. In order for you to better follow along with me, if you please could refer to the funding projections on page one of the green handout.

First of all, it is projected that the Division II budget guarantee for 1997-98 will be approximately \$10.9 million. It is currently projected that the Division II surplus will be approximately \$1.7 million in 1997-98 after funding for championships at the level of \$5.6 million, the enhancement distribution of \$3 million and the Division II reserve of a little bit over a half a million.

Any Division II championship expansion or new budget request must come from the division's projected surplus. As set forth in the new constitution, the Division II Presidents Council will approve the Division II budget on an annual basis. In order to have the appropriate budget review and oversight by the Division II governance structure, the budgeting schedule will begin earlier in the year than is currently the case. It is expected that all committee recommendations with budget implications be submitted by February 15. By April 15 of each year, it is expected that the Division II Championships Committee, the Budget and Finance Committee, and the Division II Management Council will review new budget requests and a preliminary budget for the subsequent year. The budget requests and recommendations will then be forwarded to the Division II Presidents Council for review and approval.

The Division II Presidents Council will approve and ratify the preliminary Division II budget at its April meetings. From May through August, the final budget will be prepared and forwarded to the Division II Management Council for review and the Division II Presidents Council for final approval in August.

In April and August, the new Executive Committee will meet to review the Association's budget for all three divisions and identify any potential budgetary problem areas in the Association-wide budget.

Final budget approval will be made in August by the Executive Committee. I would expect some fine tuning to be made in this budgeting process, especially as we make our way through our first year.

Thank you for your attention. I would now like to bring up Gladys Styles Johnston, the chancellor of the University of Nebraska at Kearney. Thank you.

Gladys Styles Johnston (University of Nebraska at Kearney): I'd like to explore with you some of the alternative distribution methods for the Division II enhancement fund. I'm going to present an overview that is an historical perspective as to how this has evolved and how we reached our recommendations at this point.

The history of the Division II enhancement fund began when the NCAA Executive Committee approved a \$1 million allocation for Division II from the 1991 budget.

In 1991-92, this amount increased to \$2 million and to \$3 million thereafter. A distribution formula was developed by the Division II Championship Committee. The Division II Championship Committee determined that one-half of the fund, currently at \$1½ million, should be divided equally among all Division II members who are eligible to compete in NCAA Division II championships. The committee determined that the other half of the fund should be distributed to the conference offices and independent institutions based upon their participation in the Division II men's basketball champi-

onship, using a rolling six-year period.

The equal distribution per member has ranged from a low of \$2,841 to a high of \$7,732. As a result of the Division II membership last spring, the Division II Budget Finance Subcommittee agreed to review alternative distribution models suggested by the membership. At this time, I'd like to highlight a few slides that we hope that you'll be able to see.

To those of you who may not, I'll read the question and the responses to you. Do you believe that the current method of distributing Division II's enhancement money should be changed? Currently, half of the \$3 million Division II enhancement fund is distributed to the Division II membership based on participation in the Division II men's basketball tournament over a six-year period. The other half of the fund is distributed equally to all Division II schools in good standing. The response of that survey indicated that 89 institutions or 44.5 percent voted "yes" to the question; 109 institutions voted "no," and the percentage there was 54.5 percent. There were two "no" responses.

The second slide, the answer to that question. Do you believe that the current method of distributing Division II's enhancement money should be changed? Now this was distributed to a diverse group of people—from the CEO, the athletics director and the faculty representatives. Overwhelmingly, institutions said "yes."

We then tried to look at the differences between football versus nonfootball institutions. The question: Do you believe that the current method of contributing Division II's enhancement money should be changed? We will give the "no football" institutions first. Thirty-four was recorded for no football, and the "football institutions" response was 50. The percentage ranged from 39.5 for the no football institutions to 48.7 for football. The "no" responses, 51 of the no football institutions, approximately 59 percent. The football institutions, 57, approximately 50 percent. There was one "no" response.

Another question: Do you believe that the current method of distributing Division II's enhancement money should be changed? Again, we looked at a different kind of demographic. We looked at small versus large institutions. "Small" for this analysis was institutions with enrollment smaller or equal to approximately 2,700 students. The larger institutions were then classified as those that were larger than 2,700 in enrollment. The small institutions, 48 or 49 percent said "yes." Of the larger institutions, 39 or 39.8 percent said "yes." Of the small institutions voting "no," 49 or approximately 50 percent; of the large, 58 or approximately 52 percent. Again, there was one "no response."

Focusing on another type of demographic, the private versus the public institution. Do you believe that the current method of distributing Division II's enhancement money should be changed? Among private, 36 or 49 percent say "yes," public, 53 or 42 percent, no response, private, 36 or 49 percent, equal here between yes and no. The public, 71 institutions or 56.8 percent. Again, there was no response from one institution.

The subcommittee then discussed several alternative distribution methods and determined that the six models including the current one that had the greatest membership support in this survey should be forwarded to the Division II membership for evaluation and feedback. Please note, review of alternative models is at a very preliminary stage. It is possible that additional models will be added to those being considered. The subcommittee will continue to review models and membership reaction will be solicited

through yet another survey. I'd like to move on to another area and introduce to you Jerry Hughes.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Thank you, Gladys. As was noted earlier when the enhancement fund came about in 1991 and 1992, I was vice-president of Division II and was very involved with the current distribution program that we're using. So it's kind of *deja vu* to look at some of the models that we are looking at now because we considered many division options at that point in time on the Executive Committee.

But as was indicated to you, the six the committee is looking at now does not exclude any that might be out there among you. These were the six that received the most input. There may be a better plan out there. If so, we would like to hear that.

Following the brief overview of each of the distribution models, which is on the very last page of the green sheet you have in front of you, I would like to point out that the number of provisional members we now have in Division II is approximately 45. They will share into the distribution revenue when they become active members. Thus, the amounts that we're currently receiving will be adjusted unless additional dollars are added from our enhancement fund.

The first distribution model is the one we are currently under, which is equal distribution and then men's basketball championship distribution. Last year, Division II institutions received about \$6,400 from the equal distribution portion and each basketball unit was worth approximately \$1,400. The distribution for each institution will be approximately \$5,100 when the provisional members become active members.

The second model is equal distribution and sports sponsorship and membership. This suggestion came from the Conference Commissioners Association. Their suggestion is that one half of the fund will continue to be distributed equally among all members, the other half of the fund would be distributed based upon a formula that awards points for conference membership and sports sponsorship. This model also rewards conferences that have an equal number of men's and women's sports.

The third is a straight sports sponsorship proposal. The entire fund would be divided among the member institutions based upon the total number of sports sponsored by the institution. Only sports that conduct NCAA championship competition and emerging sports for women will be considered under this proposal.

The fourth is equal distribution. The entire enhancement fund of \$3 million would be distributed equally to all Division II member institutions that are active and eligible for Division II championships.

The fifth, equal distribution in sports sponsorship. One-half of the fund would be distributed equally among all Division II member institutions. The other half of the fund would be distributed based upon the number of sports sponsored above the minimum for Division II membership. An institution would receive one unit for each sport beginning with the ninth sport, assuming you have men's and women's programs. Only sports in which the NCAA conducts championship competition and emerging sports for women will be considered in this one.

The last, six, would be a split between men's basketball and women's basketball. The fund would be distributed based upon the member institution's success in both the men's and women's basketball championship in accordance with the current provisions of establishing that amount using the six-

year rolling averages. I will now turn the podium back to President Ceddia.

Mr. Ceddia: Ladies and gentlemen, we come to the time in our presentation where we're going to open the floor for questions, discussion and suggestions. I'd like to mention that Keith Martin, director of accounting, is in attendance to field Division II finance questions or specific issues related to the enhancement fund.

I believe we have about 20 minutes or so. The microphones are open. If anyone would like to rise and make some comments or suggestions, the budget subcommittee is willing to listen.

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): Earlier, talking with Steve, I asked the question whether or not the 4.37 percent that Division II gets, is that based on the operating budget as this document indicates or the revenue generated by the NCAA in a given year?

We all know historically that they budgeted very conservatively and the revenue has always exceeded its budget. In fact, this year, the latest issue of *The NCAA News* indicated there was a lot of money left over for distribution. Do you know if that percentage is tied to the approved budget or the revenue generated?

Mr. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): Keith?

Keith E. Martin (NCAA Staff): That is going to be discussed by the oversight committee.

Mr. Hammond: I would think our advice would be that we use the revenue as long as we are going to be dealing with conservative budgeting, which has served the Association for a long time. It could make a significant difference in these figures.

Mr. Ceddia: Keith, what do you see on that one?

Mr. Martin: This is something we brought up a few weeks ago. I anticipate that each cabinet will discuss this issue. I would anticipate that this matter will be resolved in the next month or so.

Mr. Ceddia: I think that we're looking at the best guess in terms of our projection of figures. I would ask Keith to react to this, but as the Budget Finance Committee looked at its projections, we were pretty much taking the conservative approach too.

Mr. Hammond: I understand that. What body will make this decision? It could be anywhere from \$500,000 to \$600,000 to Division II.

Mr. Martin: I would anticipate the new Executive Committee would take it on.

Mr. Hammond: The new Executive Committee that's made up of 16 voting members, 12 of whom are Division I?

Mr. Ceddia: Yes. I think Adam Herbert has a comment.

Adam W. Herbert (University of North Florida): Let me explain what we've been told at the Presidents Commission level. First of all, with regard to the first column, those are the projected revenues that the NCAA will receive. It includes money from the CBS contract and all current revenue sources. So this is what is projected—the whole and constant that we are receiving from existing revenue sources and increases over the next five years from the NCAA basketball tournament and the contract related thereto.

What you see in the second column is our percentage of 4.73 percent of that pool of money. What we don't know is what is going to happen with regard to the existing sources of revenue. The Executive Committee under the new structure will have the responsibility ultimately of dealing with the

distribution of the dollars across all three divisions. We have two representatives serving on that committee.

I can tell you this: We negotiated very hard for the 4.37 percent. It was very aggressive in terms of what we insisted upon was that \$3 million that we're receiving now had to be included in the percentage. That was one of the reasons we were able to increase the total dollar amounts coming forward. But we'll be working very closely with the members from the other two divisions to assure that we get our fair share, number one, and number two, that the dollar, the total pool of money reflected in column one, will be as inclusive as possible going back to your concern.

Mr. Ceddia: Thank you. Let me add something else to follow-up. After discussing it with staff, I think we finally sorted it out.

As Division II operates with the projected budget, at the end of the fiscal year we'll know what the actual budget is based on the approved revenues. The 4.37 percent will be applied initially to the projected budget. Any adjustments would be made on a percentage basis back to us on a 4.37 percent allocation. I believe that's the way it's going to be done.

Thomas J. Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I'm representing a subcommittee of the commissioner's association. About a year ago when the restructuring was inevitable, we were asked to give input as to how we might distribute both the enhancement funds and any of the surpluses. Proposal two on the back page came from that group.

When we asked the various conferences to submit information, it became evident that the plan to distribute at least half of it based on the success of the men's basketball program was not very favorable. But one thing that is not put into proposal two that is on the green sheet is that we still propose that that million and a half be carried on for three years before the point total being carried out because some of the conferences have made commitments to full-time offices and other things in Division II that they haven't had before. We did not want to all of sudden leave them high and dry. But we felt that the distribution going back to the conferences would allow them to do things to sponsor emerging sports or in the line of gender equity, which also could include a distribution back to the individual schools in the conferences.

So I just wanted to clarify that point as to how we got to that proposal. Don Landry, who is now on your committee, was the chairman of that subcommittee. So we feel he's in very good hands here.

Mr. Ceddia: Thank you for your comments and please know that we're going to consider your suggestions again. With Don's presence on the committee I think we're going to be able to get that further reinforced.

Kelly J. Higgins (University of Alaska Fairbanks) I just wanted to bring a note here. In June, we forwarded some information on a potential idea to address the allocation of surplus funds. It is tied up currently to an existing item we have right now—the Sears Director's Cup. I know it did not get put on this docket by a committee. I applaud what the committee has done so far. There has been a lot of work to try to get through a great deal of information here. But as I looked at what was being put in there before and as I saw the commissioners' position, I found flaws. At least my personal feeling is that there was flaws there. I looked at the Division II mission statement. I'm strictly talking about striving for equitable participation and competitive excellence. I wanted to look for those things that were awarded like performance. It addresses conferences, independent institutions, which

some of the items did not address, sports sponsorship and gender issues.

Each one of those proposals I believe addresses bits and pieces of them, but didn't address them all. Isn't there some way to attach this with the existing Sears Director's Cup, working from some format of that, addressing those points directly from there?

It's not on the docket now. I know the committee has taken some more information on it. I urge each of you to review that information that I firmly believe can work. I'll be happy to send it all to you. I'll give you my e-mail address. We'll talk about that later in the session. But I urge the idea of using that policy. I think it's a good one and it's fair.

Mr. Ceddia: I would encourage you to send some follow-up comments to the committee. You can do it in care of my university or also any member of the staff working with Division II. We appreciate it. We'll take it under consideration as the committee continues to do its work.

It's to going to be a Herculean task to try to come up with a distribution method that's going to satisfy every member in this room and those who are not even in attendance. So whatever we finally decide after receiving all of the input, I think is probably at best going to still be a little bit unsettling to some folks. We will try to do the best that we can based not only on the philosophy statement but what past practice has been and what creative or innovative ideas we receive from the membership.

Ms. Miller: My question relates to the possible expansion with our provisional institutions that we have out there now and the possibility of even more in the future.

I think initially that it was discussed with the allocation that there could be an additional amount of money provided to Division II if we were going to grow immensely. Is this still on the docket somewhere? I think that was discussed. I think that was one of the reasons that we received it more favorably.

Mr. Ceddia: My staff indicated to me that that is a policy that the Executive Committee can review and consider at the time, but right now we're not looking at any specific number.

Ms. Miller: But are we going to continue to try to keep that hovering over the table for us?

Mr. Ceddia: Yes. Mike Racy mentioned that Division III also asked for that commitment last year based upon the possibility of its expansion. We've got it in our language, so we are reinforced with that.

Robert M. DeGregorio Jr. (Merrimack College): Looking at your chart on funding projections, it comes out to a reserve surplus. But how does Division II operate? There is no budget in here. How do the committees meet? How are these meetings paid for? Where does that revenue come from?

Mr. Ceddia: The Association-wide budget. Is that correct?

Mr. Martin: That's correct.

Mr. Ceddia: Well, I got that one right. It's good to hear that funny talk again from Boston.

Mr. DeGregorio: That's all a part of that 249 million? We're still able to get that back?

Mr. Ceddia: Right. That was part of the constitutional guarantee that services would be supported from the Association budget.

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): A few different things. First of all, I would like to echo the concern that conference offices rely very heavily on the NCAA enhancement money at this point. It would have a severe,

negative impact on many of us and have an affect on many of our member institutions if that would change.

The first question I have is: Who is really going to adopt the budget plan? Will it be the management group or will it come to the membership of Division II for a vote? Will it be in an option form or will it be handed down in more of a dictate?

Mr. Ceddia: I'm going to get the right answer for you in a minute. I think I know what it is, but I want to make sure. Keith.

Mr. Martin: The Division II Board of Directors will approve the Division II budget and that will subsequently go to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Salant: I understand that part. What I'm asking is: Who will decide which of these formulas will be adopted?

Mr. Martin: First, it will be reviewed by the Division II Championships Committee. It will work with the Finance and Business Cabinet to make recommendations to the Division II Management Council.

Mr. Ceddia: The recommendations will come from the subcommittee.

Mr. Salant: Wouldn't the Championships Committee be more inclined to retain control and link it to championships as opposed to the overall needs of the membership?

Mr. Ceddia: It's going to go through the presidents ultimately so the Championships Committee will reflect what the presidents would like to see happen, based upon the recommendations that that party receives.

Mr. Salant: So then in theory, this is really the last chance we have as a group to collectively comment and express concern about which formula or what type of formula will be adopted. Is that correct?

Mr. Ceddia: No, it isn't. There is going to be a survey that's going to go out again this spring to gather additional information. It's going to be presented to the Management Council and then the presidents group as well.

Mr. Salant: Two other questions. First of all, if this Division I-A football championship event does actualize and all of sudden there is 500 million to a billion dollars that come in from that area, do I understand that we will not be entitled to 4.37 percent of that money?

Mr. Ceddia: I think your understanding is correct.

Mr. Salant: Is there any chance of our management representatives raising that issue and perhaps gaining that percentage if that were actualized?

Mr. Ceddia: Short of a palace revolution with the appropriate military to back us up, I'd say no.

Mr. Salant: That's what I thought. We heard Cedric Dempsey refer to all of the different special funds yesterday and I'm just wondering which of those special funds, if any, Division II has access to, such as that fund to enable athletes who have exhausted their eligibility to continue receiving financial aid through the NCAA and continue towards a degree. Do we currently have access?

Mr. Ceddia: One of the possibilities we can do is work with the surplus we have to create that kind of an alternative.

Mr. Salant: But at this point, that's a Division I only item?

Mr. Ceddia: That's a Division I only item. But one of the things that this new structure is going to give us is the flexibility to make adjustments or come up with more alternatives that we feel are division specific to us and that conceivably could be one of them.

I understand the frustration. I don't mean to be cavalier about the possible income and new revenue from any kind of football playoff, but the real-

ity is that under this new structure, we're not going to have access to that. The trade-off, as I see it, and I think as some of the presidents see it and others, is that we're going to have much more autonomy and control over our own destiny. First of all, we're going to be controlling the budget like we never did before. With the potential of the surplus or rainy-day fund, we are going to be able to do things creatively and that are in the best interests of our student-athletes and Division II specifically. I think if we want to do something to help athletes, that might be a way in which we might use the surplus.

Mr. Salant: One last question on this. We talked about the expansion of championships. We talked about seeing volleyball, softball, baseball and some other sports expand. Have we got revised budget figures that will show how much of that expected surplus will be eaten up by all that expansion? It seems to me that although we hold a \$1 or \$2 million surplus and it seems very large, if we double the football-playing field by going to II-A and II-B, increase baseball, increase softball, increase volleyball and some others, that \$1 or \$2 million is going to disappear very quickly.

Mr. Ceddia: I want to call your attention to the green sheet in item number four. I think that the new bracket expansion the Presidents Council approved on Sunday called for a commitment of \$325,000. Beyond that, we're recommending a moratorium on any expansion until we get word on the budget itself. But the fact of the matter is, that those bracket expansions that we supported Sunday were really necessary. They have been backed up for a long time. In terms of the emerging sports, particularly for the women's sports, it needed to be done.

We're going to have the opportunity to look at the championships format. In the previous situation—I guess Jerry and I and Lynn and others can relate to this, Karen can as well because she served on the Executive Committee—when the Division II Championships Committee met as part of the Executive Committee of the Association, we'd go back to the full Executive Committee meeting with recommendations. Let me tell you, it just didn't work most of the time.

Under the new structure and under the control we now have fiscally, we're going to be in a better position to meet our needs in terms of championships formats. If you recall the presentation earlier in our session, one of the budget principles reinforces specifically a commitment to Division II championships.

Mr. Salant: Thank you.

Alan H. Patterson (Carolinas-Virginia Athletic Conference): I have a question and comment. The question is about the models of distribution. Do any of them suggest how the projected surplus would be utilized?

Mr. Ceddia: Not at this time I don't believe.

Mr. Patterson: I am interpreting that to mean that the committee does not want input into that subject.

Mr. Ceddia: We would welcome any suggestions you might have regarding how the surplus might be used.

Mr. Patterson: I think it's important for us to look at that aspect. We've really only talked about the enhancement money.

Mr. Ceddia: That's right.

Mr. Patterson: I think that is equally as important as how we will use those additional funds.

Mr. Ceddia: The survey document that's going to come out in the spring

will set forth some questions and try to gather suggestions. In the meantime if you have any, we'd welcome them.

Mr. Patterson: In my opinion, as Nate mentioned, this will be the last time that we meet to do this. Often, I find it crucial to meet with a variety of individuals. It helps me to coalesce my thoughts and our thoughts where a survey sometimes doesn't do that. So when we can look at those things here, I think that helps.

Secondly, as I looked at the report from the commissioners group relative to this, what we have here is a very abridged version of that. I think it linked some phase-in period relative to it. I think that it did include utilization of the projected surplus as well as the enhancement funds. It looked at gender-equity items and it looked at not placing all of the burden on one sport or two sports to determine how those funds would be distributed.

Many of you have conferences we don't have. Many of you have a budget that is quite important to you. I know that part of this was to see that conference moneys were not diminished over the long period and that the phase-in and utilization of these moneys would guarantee that we would have a sufficient amount to do our work, not have additional dues and allow us to distribute back to our membership via the conference moneys that might be involved.

I would ask the committee to look at the complete recommendation of the conference commissioners. I think it goes a good bit beyond what we have in front of us at this time. I think it would be good for the membership to be able to see that complete document. I think it makes a bit of a difference. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ceddia: Just a quick follow-up. We did add Don Landry to the committee for that very purpose. He's going to be able to speak from the commissioner's point of view. I know he will spend time during our upcoming meetings making the committee focus on the full perspectives.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I want to commend the committee on all this work. I know how it gets when you start talking about dollars and cents. I also appreciate you doing a follow-up survey. I think a lot of us probably filled out that survey, and when the question about distribution came up, we didn't know how much or if any additional moneys were going to be there; the status quo seemed to make a lot of sense. I think with this information, with some of the discussion that we've had here, it certainly is enlightening to a lot of us. We can go back and reevaluate our situation.

A comment to Kelly Higgins' suggestion about the Sears Cup. We are so competitive in so many areas. With regionalization, I just would like us to consider distributing—if there is going to be distribution of funds—on maybe sports sponsorship more than the Sears Cup. We're going to get into the regional seeding, to regional selection committees. All of a sudden, the intensity is going to rise because somebody is going to see getting into that championship is going to create additional revenue sources for us. If we can keep that in mind, I would appreciate that as well.

Finally, Tony, if you could address the time frame that we're talking about in terms of when you want feedback and when the Management Council is going to have a definitive plan as to how this is going to be distributed.

Mr. Ceddia: On your first point, I would suggest that right after the Convention, as soon as you can, we would appreciate any comments based on the discussion today. The survey instrument will probably be out some-

time in February or March. We're going to try to wrap up the committee's work late this spring so that we can get something to the appropriate parties at that time. We do have a window of a few months. I would again encourage you to discuss it.

The other thing, for those of you who are going to have conference meetings or a chance to do something through telephone conference calls, if you want to share ideas and then try to crystallize a recommendation, we would certainly welcome that. For the independents in the room, if they hook up with each other and have suggestions they recommend, we would appreciate it. So, we're certainly not going to have a forum on this again before the final recommendations are produced. But I still believe there is an opportunity for the membership to get its input into the process.

J. Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown): We are one of those independent institutions. There aren't many.

Mr. Ceddia: You also beat us in basketball the other night. I'm not happy about that ...

Mr. Capon: We are one of the independent institutions with a small minority of the membership. But I think I'm speaking for the other independents when I say that any proposal such as the one that came from the commissioners, which seems to exclude the independents from about half of the funding, would be met with a great deal of concern. I would encourage the committee to solicit input from the independents.

We don't have conferences where we can get together and come up with a conference opinion. It's difficult for us as scattered independents to get together and express our opinions. I would just like to encourage the committee to take a look at what it can do to solicit input from the independent institutions.

Mr. Ceddia: Tim Dillon is really the independent institutions' rep. In watching him and trying to control him during our meetings, I can assure you that he's going to represent your point of view very well.

Thomas J. Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I just want to say that the commissioners did not do anything on behalf of the independents because we didn't want to be presumptuous enough to say that we thought that we knew what should be done with them.

We had felt that the committee would solicit their advice and input. I certainly would encourage you to do it. I do believe some type of formula could be worked out to satisfy them as well.

Mr. Ceddia: Thank you. We are at the end of our time. I want to thank the subcommittee members who made the presentations today and also reiterate that we're looking forward to your recommendations and suggestions. We'll get you the survey as soon as we can. Lynn.

Ms. Dorn: Tony, again, on behalf of everyone, we want to thank you and your committee for your outstanding efforts and work. Acknowledging the fact that the committee has only met twice in person and two times by conference call, I can really see how accelerated their efforts have been.

[The Division II business session was recessed.]

Tuesday Morning, January 14, 1997

The meeting was called to order at 9 a.m., with Lynn L. Dorn presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Dorn: Our agenda this morning will be as follows: We're going to

begin with Proposal No. 113, which is found on Page 184. We will continue voting until we are finished with all proposals. Then we'll go into the continuation of discussion of the forum related to the transition, followed by a request for a waiver from a member institution, other business, closing remarks and then we will be adjourned.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Visit Unrelated to Recruitment—National Student-Athlete Day

Leon G. Kerry: (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association) On behalf of the Council and Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, I move Proposal 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to exempt National Student-Athlete Day activities held on an institution's campus from the limitations on providing entertainment to a prospect.

National Student-Athlete Day is a significant event recognizing and bringing together athletes of all abilities. This proposal demonstrates the Association's commitment to encourage athletics participation and facilitates the promotion of issues related to student-athlete welfare. Prospective student-athletes should have an opportunity to participate in National Student-Athlete Day activity within their community. Their participation should be exempt from counting as an official visit.

[Proposal No. 113 (Page A-190) was adopted.]

Tryout Exception—Golf and Tennis

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I would like to move Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

We really feel that 115 is legislation that is going to assist the Division II membership tremendously. We have a large number of part-time coaches and small, local universities. Having those individuals working, it makes it pretty tough for them to make a decision on whether or not they are going to help a university in their community if they cannot work with local individuals who happen to be prospective student-athletes. I urge your support on 115.

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-191) was adopted.]

Reconsideration of Recruiting—Telephone Calls— Divisions I and II Football

Pete Chapman (Wayne State College, Nebraska): I'd like to move to reconsider Proposal No. 99. I voted on the prevailing side of the proposal.

[The motion was seconded.]

I'd just like to have an opportunity to reconsider and maybe talk about the issue a little bit before we vote on it again.

Thomas E. Spicer (Fort Hays State University): The reason that we need to reconsider this is to put some consistency in the recruiting efforts of our football coaches. As you will see, Division I did pass this. I'm afraid that in the states that have several Division I and Division II institutions, there will be mass confusion with the recruits as to why one institution is calling and the other isn't if they are considered to be that type of a talent.

I think this is the last time that we would have an opportunity to do something as an NCAA body that would reflect the entire recruiting process for

a sport. I would encourage you to reconsider passing this legislation so that our coaches have the same opportunity to recruit in-state as well as out-of-state talents.

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): One point that needs to be made here: this is a cost-reduction measure that if they can identify interests from a student-athlete as a junior, then they can pull off and put thousands of dollars back on to those campuses that will serve the student-athletes on the campus. So the student-athlete is certainly served better.

Dan O'Callaghan (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Rollins College): This is a consistency matter with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We feel it is an extra burden upon the student-athletes. Furthermore, as far as receiving information in a particular time frame, when you are a junior in high school and you are receiving information in May, you are just as interested in that school as they are in you at that particular time. You are not going to be able to make up your mind at that time even if you are not a great athlete and you are not going to get your signed letter of intent. It's just a matter of consistency with all other sports and having to deal with the burden of phone calls during that time. Thank you.

Ms. Dorn: Any further discussion on the motion to reconsider? At this time we are prepared to vote. The vote is on Proposal 99 to reconsider.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 99 (Page A-172) was adopted.]

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): Before my gender is questioned about speaking to this issue, I do administer a football program.

We are voting against it because my football coach asked to vote against it. We felt at this point in the recruiting process, any student-athlete or any prospective student he calls is going to say, "yes, I'm interested" because they are so far away from the process that they haven't settled on anything and therefore they are not going to eliminate any possibility. It will not be a cost-containment proposition. It will, however, change the calling calendar. We will simply be administering different dates for different sports within Division II.

I would also like to point out that the prospective students that Division II is going to be seeking with Division I institutions are probably going to be eventually be looking at I-AA, and I-AA did defeat this motion. Only I-A passed it.

Mr. Spicer: I believe I-AA will probably come back in and try to do the same thing that some of us are trying to do, which is pass this. The other issue is that the students who she alluded to are the very ones who we're going to try to get from the I-A system. Those are roster players to Division I, but they will be players for Division II. I ask to call the vote.

Ms. Dorn: The question has been called, we are now going to...

F. Paul Bogan (Northeast-10 Conference): Point of order, please. You had a gentleman at the microphone. In all fairness I think you ought to let the gentlemen speak.

Ms. Dorn: Thank you. In terms of consistency and treatment of the issue yesterday, we honor the speaker at number seven.

Terry Wanless (University of North Dakota): I want to make a little declaration about yesterday's events because it's kind of gotten to be a point of contention. I in no way attempted to deal with the issue of gender. I talked to the young lady after the Convention yesterday. I explained my position. I wasn't challenging her right as a female to talk about the sport of football.

I would never do that. I hope all of us in this Convention are long past that issue. I was bringing to the forefront that it was only going to affect a segment of our student-athlete population, not our total population. So I apologize to her, I apologize to this group if you feel that way. I certainly would never in any way want to demean our student-athlete group. I certainly appreciate and support everything they do. I talked to the young lady and for all of those of you who somehow arrived at the conclusion that I'm a male chauvinist pig, I can assure you it's not true. I hope that if I offended anybody, you will forgive me. Thank you.

Ms. Dorn: I do acknowledge and appreciate your comments and I think they were very appropriate. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-172) was defeated upon reconsideration.]

Camps and Clinics—Employment of Prospects—Division II

F. Paul Bogan (Northeast-10 Conference): On behalf of the Northeast-10 Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit the student-athlete to work in summer camps at the institution he plans to attend as a freshman. We allow sophomores, juniors and seniors to work at these camps, but we deny that opportunity to freshmen. As long as he has been accepted or has signed a letter of intent, this legislation would give him that opportunity. It seems strange that this same individual could work at camps B, C and D, but could not work at the same camp of the institution he plans to attend. I hope the body will support this measure.

Thomas R. Wistrick (Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference): A point of clarification. It's my understanding with the passing of this that whenever student-athletes would receive an offer of admission from any institution, they could then work in any sports camp or clinic at any institution? Any written offer of admission or financial aid or National Letter of Intent from any institutions would allow a prospect to work at any sports camp or clinic at any other institutions?

Mr. Bogan: You mean to tell me if he's been accepted by four institutions and has signed a letter of intent, that's the only institution he can work in?

Mr. Wistrick: What I am saying is if I signed a written offer of admission, does this only allow me to work in that institution's sport camp or clinic?

Mr. Bogan: For this legislation, that is my understanding, yes.

Mr. Wistrick: That's not the way I'm reading that.

Unidentified Delegate: Paul, you can only sign one National Letter of Intent, but you can get written offers of admissions from other institutions.

Ms. Dorn: Paul and Tom, here's what we'd like to request. We'd like clarification from the sponsors as to their interpretation of his question. Could you please clarify the intent of your proposal in reference to the question?

Mr. Bogan: The intent was to allow the individual attending an institution to work at its summer camps. Right now, he could work at other summer camps at other institutions, but he could not work at the institution where he was going to attend whether he had a scholarship or financial aid or signed a letter of intent. He is not eligible to work at that camp.

We'd like to provide that student-athlete that opportunity. If he can do it at other institutions whether he's been accepted there or not, why can't he do it at the institution he wants to attend?

Charles A. "Tod" Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I'm not as good on the rules as I used to be because my compliance people are getting so much better. I don't get any practice anymore. But is a prospect that has not matriculated, as Paul said, permitted to work at another institution's camp? I was under the impression they were not permitted to accept it at School A. I think he said they can't work at A now but they can work at B, C and D where they are not going. I was under the impression they are not permitted to do that. I'd like a clarification on that.

Thomas Gallagher (New York Collegiate Athletic Conference): One of the things that seems to be confusing, it's not the National Letter of Intent, Paul, it's when the institution has written an offer of admission. There could be a number of schools to which that student-athlete would be accepted. When we're looking up the rule, could we take that into consideration? If it's not one school, it could be multiple schools.

Robert A. Oliver (NCAA Staff): Currently, our legislation does not permit a Division II institution to employ or give reduced admission to anyone who has started the ninth grade. So the question as to whether Division II institutions currently can employ prospects, the answer to that is "no." You cannot employ or give reduced admission to a prospect at an institutional camp. Bylaw 13.13.1.5.2 is the citation on that for those of you who might have your Manual with you.

The proposal as I understand it, allows an institution to employ a prospect who has signed a National Letter of Intent or offered written acceptance to the institution. To go back to the proposers, we're trying to determine their intent. That's where Paul can identify what was intended—to be employed at any institution or just the one that the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent with or been offered a letter of acceptance. Then that gets a little more complicated, because a student could be offered a letter of acceptance to multiple colleges.

Mr. Bogan: The intent was exactly that—to let the individual who is going to attend that institution work in that summer camp, which is denied right now. That was our intent.

Ms. Dorn: To clarify the point, your intention is to allow the student-athlete to be employed at the institution that he or she has received a National Letter of Intent, a letter of admission and/or financial aid.

Mr. Bogan: That's correct.

Thomas E. Spicer (Fort Hays State University): I think the intent is good. I would like to see our freshmen who come into our university be able to work at our summer camps. However, I need to bring this up for food for thought. The reason that this rule was put in place is to curve the recruiting wars and let coaches who have large summer camps—of which nobody knows what the prevailing rate of employment may be—use them as a recruiting tool. You sign the list and you come work our summer camp. I think that's why the rule is in place—to keep that kind of thing from happening. I encourage you to think about that before we vote on it.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I missed the answer to the question. If an individual has six letters of acceptance of admission and does not sign the letter of intent, that individual then has the opportunity to be employed at all six of those camps? Is that correct?

Mr. Bogan: Jim, the intent is to allow him to work at the institution he is planning to attend. We don't want him to work summer camps at four or five institutions from the time he gets out of high school. It's intended only

for the institution he plans to attend. Now, not everyone has a letter of intent. When we wrote this legislation, that's why we said a signed letter of some sort. He's been accepted. He plans on going. He plans on attending that institution. He's going to that institution.

Mr. Fallis: My concern is this individual has graduated and still hasn't definitely decided which institution he's going to attend.

Even though they have three letters accepting them, there may not be any financial aid involved. Yet, this individual has three letters and now three coaches will call that individual and say, "come and work our camp this summer."

Mr. Bogan: For example, a freshman comes in for football. He hasn't attended a day of classes and yet we make him eligible for football. He is eligible right then on that day. When you go through your list, the moment he turns up in that camp, he is eligible. All we're saying here is the individual who has signed that letter of intent to that institution, has planned to go and has been accepted to go to that institution, has the opportunity right now to work in summer camp. I don't know if we have an answer to the question that Todd asked. I'm curious about that. I thought he could work at the other institutions. Am I correct?

Ms. Dorn: Paul, the clarification that I heard legislative services provide is that that would not be correct.

Mr. Bogan: I think that question was asked. The response we got back was he can work at the other institutions but he could not work at the institution where he was planning to attend. Now maybe I'm wrong on that, too.

Mr. Oliver: I think that the dilemma is that you do have students who have not formally decided where they are going to go in the summer and have two or three offers. There is a concern relative to that "open-endedness" to that offer of admission to an institution. I think you probably need to say that your intent was that the prospect could only work at one Division II institution during the summer, but the proposal doesn't say that.

Ms. Dorn: We're going to provide an alternative clarification. Not a clarification, what are we doing Nancy?

Nancy L. Mitchell (NCAA Staff): Sure, it's a clarification. At least I hope it will be. Paul, what I was hearing you say earlier and given Bob's interpretation that you cannot work at other institutions' camps now, this will allow you to work at an institution with which you have signed a National Letter of Intent. It sounded as though you were saying for institutions that do not have a National Letter of Intent, you go to the second tier, where we would say an institution has a written offer of admission and/or financial aid.

Mr. Bogan: That's correct.

Ms. Mitchell: If that is the case, you could, with the understanding that that was the sponsor's intent, ask the Council at its post-Convention meeting to offer an interpretation to that effect. Wait, I don't think you can sponsor noncontroversial legislation for recruiting, but you can modify it to conform to the intent. You could actually say that in this proposal and bring it to the Council after the Convention. I don't know if that helps anybody, but if that is your intent, then we could get that language in this proposal and you can vote on it with that understanding.

Mr. Bogan: Would it be better for me to withdraw this so that we can clean it up and can understand it better?

Ms. Mitchell: That is certainly an option, Paul, yes.

Mr. Bogan: I think that may be in our best interests. I hate to pass leg-

isolation and then get an interpretation that will make it hard for the people at the office. I withdraw this on the behalf of the Northeast-10 at this time and will bring it back next year.

Ms. Dorn: Paul, unfortunately, since the proposal has been moved, we are unable to have it withdrawn.

Mr. Bogan: I can have it withdrawn if I can find out who seconded it, right? Isn't that possible?

Ms. Dorn: No, it did receive a second. An alternative would be to defeat the motion.

Mr. Bogan: I don't like to lose, though.

Ms. Dorn: Well, get ready for it. Any further discussion on the proposal before us? Paul, thank you very much.

[Proposal No. 116 (Page A-192) was defeated.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Camps and Clinics

C. Donald Cook (Sacred Heart University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 144.

[The motion was seconded.]

The general principle in Bylaw 17 regarding the number of student-athletes who may be employed in an institution's camp or clinic is no longer necessary inasmuch as in all sports other than Division I football, it is now permissible for an institution to employ its student-athletes in its camps or clinics. The committee notes that it remains impermissible for student-athletes to engage in organized practice activities under the guise of an institutional camp or clinic.

This proposal merely deletes a principle that no longer is applicable. In the spirit of deregulation, we respectfully urge your support.

[Proposal No. 144 (Page A-227) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Divisions I and II

Robert T. Becker (Saginaw Valley State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal represents a significant portion of the NCAA Council's deregulation and simplification package. The Legislative Review Committee spent the last year analyzing Bylaw 17 and determined that the best way to simplify Bylaw 17 would be to eliminate the distinction between traditional and nontraditional playing seasons and establish a consistent date for the start of preseason practice as well as the first permissible contest and the end of the regular season in each sport.

In addition, the committee believes that establishing a length of playing season option based only on a consistent number of days would greatly simplify Bylaw 17 without compromising an institution's flexibility in calculating its playing season. It is important to note that institutions will continue to be provided the opportunity to conduct two distinct consecutive-day segments in which the majority of the practices and competition opportunities occur in the segment in which the NCAA championship in that sport occurs. In sports in which the NCAA championship does not occur during the fall term, the date for the beginning preseason practice and competition will be consistent with the date that currently exists for the nontraditional

segment. In sports in which the championship does occur during the fall term, the date for the start of practice in competition would be consistent with the date that currently exists for the traditional segment. The committee was cognizant that a limited number of institutions may wish to begin their season earlier than the prescribed dates either because of climatic conditions or because there is not a significant emphasis on participation in national championship competition in that sport.

The committee believes that the Administrative Review Panel is the appropriate place to seek relief in those instances. The adoption of this proposal will eliminate a significant number of pages from Bylaw 17, and that would be helpful.

Through simplification, we'll ease the burden institutions are faced with as they try to establish playing and practice seasons in up to 27 different sports. The committee would like to emphasize that this proposal primarily is one of simplification and deregulation and does not extend substantively to modifying the method in which the institutions compute their playing seasons. I urge your support for this legislation.

[Proposal No. 145 (Page A-228) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Annual Exemptions—Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer and Softball

Dan Ghormley (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the ECAC, I would like to move Proposal 122-C.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of 1996 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 73 allowed Division II institutions to annually exempt one season-ending competition. The sport of ice hockey was inadvertently omitted from this legislation last year. Proposal 122-C places ice hockey with all other team sports and makes a consistent application of the season-ending tournament exemption legislation. I urge your support, thank you.

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 122-C, but since my document says exactly what that gentlemen just said, I'm not going to reread this to everybody. For that reason, the Division II Steering Committee urges your support on the passage of 122. Thank you.

[Part C of Proposal No. 122 (Page A-199) was adopted.]

Contest Exemptions—Division II Basketball

F. Paul Bogan (Northeast-10 Conference): I move Proposal 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit Division II institutions to exempt annually not more than two informal practice scrimmages from the maximum number of permissible contests. Right now, you can take two exhibition games from the basketball limitation, one against a foreign team and one against a certified AAU team.

We're asking that two informal scrimmages be added. It is not adding any more games or any more contests in any way, it's just an option. Now instead of one or two and two, you have a two and three option. If you play a foreign team, you had to have an informal scrimmage. The reason for that is, in Division II to bring a foreign team over is very expensive, so this is cost containment. Now, if you play an AAU team, I don't know how some of the people may not agree, but there have been some problems with some of the

AAU teams. They are very tough to control. So we feel this is good legislation and a good benefit to the athletics programs.

[Proposal No. 123 (Page A-202) was adopted.]

Contest Exemptions—Division II Football—Pioneer Bowl

Wallace Jackson (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors of this proposal, the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I'd like to move Proposal 124.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation will afford an opportunity for representatives of the CIAA and the SIAC to participate in a postseason football bowl game. All members of the CIAA and the SIAC will continue to participate in the Division II football championships, if eligible and selected for participation.

There is significant interest and support for this proposal from our student-athletes in both conferences. This contest would be played after the conclusion of the NCAA Division II football championship. Please note, we are strong supporters of the Division II football championship and have no desire to become a new championship. Practice for this game will be treated the same as other bowl games. Passing this legislation would not be setting any precedent. This legislation has also been passed in Division I-AA.

This proposal provides an opportunity for publicity, possible television exposure and an opportunity to raise funds. Successful passage of this proposal will be beneficial not only for the two conferences but all Division II football-playing institutions. Student-athletes in Division II will look forward to this opportunity. We urge all of your support for this proposal. Thank you.

James F. Battle (Virginia Union University): The opportunity for Division II student-athletes to display their athletics skills in a postseason bowl format is practically nonexistent. The entire effort toward opportunity seems to be concentrated at the Division I level. Division II student-athletes have the same aspiration and needs as Division I student-athletes. We ought to afford them the opportunity to display their skills in this type of competitive game.

It also has potential to generate much-needed revenue for the institutions involved in this bowl. The impact on the academic achievement of these student-athletes is insignificant. We urge you to vote in support of Proposal 124. Thank you.

Andrew Hinson (Cheyney University of Pennsylvania): I'm the national chair for Division II football championships. I rise in support of this proposal. I want to commend both the CIAA and the SIAC for initiating this legislation and getting Division II into the bowl picture. I also offer my support for all Division II universities who want to get into the bowl situation. I will support that. I ask for your support of this legislation because it will not interfere with the Division II playoff format. Thank you.

Richard Cosby (Clark Atlanta University): We hosted the world this past summer in bringing the world there to participate in Olympic games. We'd like to do the same thing with this visionary approach for this football game. This football game offers another opportunity for postseason play. It also could be a demonstration for other Division II institutions for inter-regional competition between conferences.

The academic welfare of student-athletes will not be negatively impact-

ed by playing this football game after the Division II playoff and after the season is completed. I urge your support for this particular proposal.

[Proposal No. 124 (Page A-203) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Spring Practice—Divisions I and II Football

G. Dennis Wilson (Auburn University): I'm chair of the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. I'd like to move Proposal 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports has developed proposed legislation to address the injury risk in spring football. The legislation proposes three changes.

First, spring football contact days should be reduced from 10 to five while maintaining 15 total practice opportunities. Secondly, the initial two practice opportunities should be noncontact. Third, shoulder pads should not be worn in noncontact practices.

The committee initiated this legislation because it has established the principle that student-athletes in any sport should not be exposed to out-of-season injury risk that is higher than experienced in the regular season. The NCAA Injury Surveillance System reveals that the injury risk for an individual in spring football is more than twice that of fall practice. In addition, injuries that involve significant health consequences such as concussions, injuries requiring surgery and injuries to the anterior cruciate ligament, are two to three times more likely in the spring.

The proposed legislation is based upon what the committee believes is solid research and consistency with existing legislation. It is supported by the College and University Training Committee, the American Orthopaedic Society for Sports Medicine and the American Medical Society for Sports Medicine.

The rationale is as follows for reduced contact. Over 80 percent of the injuries happen during contact practices. To reduce the injury rate at spring practice, modifications must begin with this activity. Injury Surveillance System data show two specific examples when a reduction in spring practice contact dates had an immediate effect on injury rates and no apparent effect on the quality of the sport.

It should be noted that when these changes were made, they were not written with injury-reduction considerations in mind, but rather by the Presidents Commissions desire to reduce time demands on student-athletes. The first example you'd be aware of occurred in the spring of 1990. Division II got only 12 spring practices, none of which involved contact. In 1990, Division II spring-football-injury rates were more than 50 percent lower than previous or subsequent years where contact practice was involved, and there was no increase in fall-injury rates in the subsequent fall.

The second example occurred in Division I in 1991. Spring practice contact days were reduced from 15 to 10. The injury rate that year decreased 20 percent. The rationale for two additional noncontact practices: Existing legislation requires the first three practice days in fall football be noncontact conditioning drills to allow the student-athlete to acclimate to the activity. This proposed legislation recognized the need for this same type of practice in the spring, and the rationale for no shoulder pads in noncontact practices.

Legislation permitting use of shoulder pads during designated noncontact spring practices was approved in 1994 against the competitive safeguard committee's recommendation. The argument at that time was that shoulder pads needed to be allowed in noncontact days to reduce the number of shoulder injuries. In fact, that has not happened. The number of shoulder injuries have not been reduced. In fact, the percent of injuries during noncontact practices has gone up since the introduction of shoulder pads in those practices. In fact, in many institutions there is now little difference between contact and noncontact practices. The competitive safeguard committee concluded and we strongly believe that there is a difference in the regular and spring football practice injury rate. It is real, significant and preventable. We urge your support of this legislation.

Frank Cignetti (Indiana University of Pennsylvania): First, I would like to compliment Dennis and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports for the work they've done in bringing this issue to our attention. It's a very serious issue. I believe those statistics are valid.

However, I would like to refer Proposal 125 to the Division II Management Council. Let's have them review it and then refer it to the appropriate committee for further study.

[The motion was seconded.]

My rationale for this referral is that I know that many people are concerned about this legislation.

There are three issues involved in the legislation. Number one, reducing contact days from 10 to five. Many people feel this is a drastic reduction. Somewhere between 10 and five may be the optimal number of contact days for spring practice. Number two, the issue of using shoulder pads on noncontact days. Should we have the shoulder pad or should we eliminate the shoulder pad as the legislation states? The third issue is really distinguishing between injuries that occur during contact phases of practice and noncontact phases.

I'm a coach. I have seen many knee injuries occur without contact. An athlete makes the play, and out goes an ACL or an ankle. I have seen receivers and defensive backs go out on days without shoulder pads, running skill practices to develop the passing game. I've seen the receiver go to the ground and separate his shoulder.

I think the legislation, I think the intent is very good. I think the proposal needs further study. I think we should refer this proposal, as Division I-A and I-AA football did, to another committee. We should refer it to our Management Council. Let them review it and then send it to another committee for further study.

And the last point, if I am correct, I can stand corrected on this, this legislation would not go into effect until August 1. Therefore, it would not apply to this spring. It would give us another year to study the issue. Thank you.

Douglas T. Porter (Fort Valley State University): Basically, I support Frank's suggestion that we refer for further study because of the impact it would have on football-playing institutions. I would not like to see us make a hasty decision today and then come back later and say that we moved too quickly on this. I'm speaking in favor of referral.

Terry O'Brien (National Athletic Trainers' Association): I am not speaking against the referral on this issue. However, the proposed legislation is sound, as is the data it is based on.

We urge the Council again to give strong consideration to the intent of

Proposal 125. The intent is to reduce the incident of spring-football-injury rates. The College and University Athletic Trainers Committee looks forward to working with you on this effort. Thank you for your consideration.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I echo the sentiments for referral. As sound as the legislation is, it sounds as though our counterparts in the other divisions are recommending referral. I would like to see, as my athletic trainer has asked, that they see more research that is Division II specific. I understand a lot of the research is Division I. Let's see what the Division II research really does say. Although there are some legitimate points in the legislation, our trainer does not have a concern with the contact, but rather with the shoulder pads. Thank you.

Dan O'Callaghan (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Rollins College): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we'd like to just state that we support the legislation and oppose the referral.

Ms. Dorn: Thank you. Any further discussion on the motion to refer? We are now prepared to vote on referral of Proposal No. 125. Division II football-playing institutions only.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-205) was referred to the Division II Management Council.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Out-of-Season Practice—Basketball

Wil G. Shaw (Morehouse College): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 147.

[The motion was seconded.]

The legislation that permits members of an institution's basketball team to participate in a wheelchair basketball game at the close of the regular season is rarely, if ever, invoked. Therefore, the committee believes that such legislation is unnecessary.

An institution that wishes to participate in such a contest may request a waiver of the prohibition against out-of-season athletically related activity from the Administrative Review Panel. Elimination of this subsection would help reduce the length of Bylaw 17. In the spirit of deregulation, we urge your support.

Thomas J. Kearns (Northern Kentucky University): I'm not sure what the sponsors defined "rarely" to be. Such an event occurs on our campus every year. So the effect for us is to trade a routine exception for an appeal to the Legislative Review Committee. Can you ask how many other campuses would be similarly affected before we vote?

Ms. Dorn: Please, in response to his request, would those institutions please who have wheelchair games annually raise their paddle? Frequently?

Mr. Kearns: I'll accept that as rarely. We'll live with it.

[Proposal No. 147 (Page A-233) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Outside Competition—Basketball

David O'Toole (Bellarmino College): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, we move the adoption of Proposal 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

The committee recognizes the amount of paperwork with which the membership is faced and felt that it would seize this piece of legislation as an opportunity to decrease that amount.

Adoption of this proposal would eliminate the requirement that the NCAA Council must approve participation of sanctioned outside-team tours in the

sport of basketball. Such tours would be sanctioned only on an institutional basis in accordance with existing Bylaw 30.7, and only if more than two of the institution's basketball student-athletes participate.

We respectfully urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 149 (Page A-235) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Outside Teams—Water Polo

Paul A. Lueken (Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania): I would like to move Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

Water polo and other facility-constrained sports do not have the same advantages as many other sports where numerous opportunities are available for coaches and athletes to be involved with their sports during the summer months.

Athletes wishing to play these sports have plenty of opportunity to do so; however, student-athletes in the sport of water polo have specific requirements that include a requisite number of teammates and a coach. These requirements are normally found through the local college. However, current legislation prevents institutions from allowing their coaches to be involved or participate with student-athletes.

This results in the elimination of any local club involvement and the opportunity to see the sport grow. With water polo programs trying to maintain growing numbers and women's water polo being designated as an emerging sport by the NCAA, the proposed legislation is vital to the sport on a collegiate level for men and women. I urge your support.

Richard Wettan (Queens College, New York): I rise in support of the motion. In light of what we did yesterday to remove restrictions on basketball summer practice, we're urging you do the same for water polo.

There are less than 50 water polo institutions in the NCAA, maybe only five in Division II. It's almost impossible for a student who wants to participate in water polo in the summer not to run into his coach. We ask you to support the removal of this.

Theodore S. Paulauskas (St. Anselm College): I rise as a member of the NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee to encourage your support of Proposal No. 128.

The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes strongly that this proposal can assist in the growth of water polo and also stem the decline of the number of schools and student-athletes participating in the sport at the college level. Water polo is unique because of the scarcity of facilities, players and competitive opportunities as well as its struggle to maintain sufficient sponsorship for an NCAA championship. Any sport in such circumstances should be given every chance to succeed in the intercollegiate environment so that more significant measures won't be necessary in the future. On behalf of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I ask that you not let the opportunity escape to create more developmental opportunities for student-athletes. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-208) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Divisions I and II Extraordinary Personnel Losses

Shirley Green Reese (Albany State University, Georgia): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move Proposal

No. 146.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over the past year, the Legislative Review Committee's deregulation and simplification efforts have focused on Bylaw 17. Part of that focus has been centered on reducing the length of the bylaw.

This proposal, if adopted, would remove a section from many of the 27 sports within Bylaw 17. In addition, the committee notes that the legislation governing waivers based on extraordinary personnel losses appears inconsistently throughout Bylaw 17.

Furthermore, the legislation appears in some sports and not in others. It also appears in some sports that are currently available to some divisions and not others. Under current NCAA legislation, waivers for extraordinary personnel losses must be approved by the NCAA Council. The committee believes that the Administrative Review Panel is the appropriate avenue to seek relief of an application of playing- and practice-season legislation when such extraordinary personnel losses occur. As in the past, such approval will be a mere formality.

Along with the Council, we urge your support. Thank you.

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): I have a concern about all of the things we are starting to send to the Administrative Review Panel. My experience in handling waivers and other requests within our conference is that panel frequently takes as long as a month to come back with a decision. As we send more and more of these waivers, which may be infrequent in the individual sense but begin to build, are we not creating discomfort by lengthening time spans? When there is a personnel loss problem and some of these other things, we need instant answers. That's something I would like to see the group consider.

I'm certainly not opposed to the crucible behind the legislation. I think the rule should be standardized for all sports in all divisions, but this is a real concern. I'd like to know if there is anything in the works to speed up the ARP in terms of how quickly it handles cases and how quickly it meets?

Nancy L. Mitchell (NCAA Staff): Nate, under the new governance structure, all of the Division II appeals will be handled by the Management Council. So the volume will be less. I'm certain that that group is going to look at ways to make it a more efficient and a more effective process. But until we get to the new structure in August of 1997, I don't know that there is going to be any effort to really just revamp the Administrative Review Panel's operations.

But this doesn't become effective until August 1, 1997. This would just go to the Division II Management Council. The volume should be less.

[Proposal No. 146 (Page A-233) was adopted.]

Transfer—Positive Drug Test

G. Dennis Wilson (Auburn University): I'm the chair of the competitive safeguards committee, and I'd like to move Proposal 136.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 136 simply stipulates that if a student tests positive from an NCAA-administered drug test and is declared ineligible, the information that they are ineligible goes with them if they transfer to another institution.

A student could conceivably test positive for a drug, transfer to another institution and that institution would not be aware of it. They would not

know that they are ineligible. There's a loophole in the system. The Council and the Executive Committee support this legislation.

Gene A. Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): First of all, I want to commend Dennis Wilson. I think he's done an outstanding job in leading the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. That committee worked very, very hard—probably the hardest-working committee that I've seen in the Association.

As a member of the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, our committee thanks the NCAA Council and the Executive Committees for supporting this legislation.

It seems obvious that a mechanism should be in place for student-athletes who test positive from the NCAA drug-testing program and are ruled ineligible by their institutions to preclude their transferring to another NCAA school without that school's knowledge that the student-athlete is under drug suspension. Our committee discovered that such safeguards do not exist. This proposal will provide schools with the security of full disclosure of a student-athlete's status if he or she violated the NCAA drug testing legislation and was ruled ineligible as a result of that violation. The competitive safeguards committee appreciates your support of Proposal 136.

Robert DeGregorio Jr. (Merrimack College): I am in support of this, but I have one question. Will it be added to the NCAA student-athlete drug testing form that he signs? Will he be informed that this is going to take place so we don't run into legal ramifications in disclosing personal private information?

Nancy L. Mitchell (NCAA Staff): I don't know that we've talked specifically about adding that to the student-athlete's statement. It's not part of the legislation, but that is something that we can take back to the Council and note your concerns.

Don Kaverman (Missouri Western State College): I think I understand the intent of the proposers here, but this legislation does not specifically state an NCAA-sanctioned drug test. It just indicates if a student-athlete who is declared ineligible due to a positive "drug test." Is there going to be an interpretation to clarify that?

Ms. Mitchell: My understanding is that the legislative services staff has been indicating that it does only refer to an NCAA drug test because that's the intent of the sponsors. Dennis, is that correct?

Mr. Wilson: Yes, currently the only way a student-athlete can be declared ineligible is as a result of an NCAA test. I think that's implicit in this.

Ms. Mitchell: We would take that to the NCAA Council post-Convention meeting to ask to clarify that through an interpretation.

Mr. Kaverman: Thank you.

[Proposal No. 136 (Page A-217) was adopted.]

Resolution: Division II Championships—Automatic Qualification

Thomas Kearns (Northern Kentucky University): On behalf of all 12 members of the Great Lakes Valley Conference, I move Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the intent of this proposal should be clear despite some publication errors. The conference views this as a fairness issue. We now have a division philosophy statement that refers to equitable participation and offers opportunity for participation.

If we're serious, we should extend this philosophy to our championships.

We don't think we have yet. To give you just one example, in our men's basketball region, six teams out of 30 in three conferences went to the regional tournament last year, but in soccer, it was only three teams in five conferences and 40 teams. We need to be more sensitive to the effect of this kind of inequity on our student-athletes. The bracket expansion that has been suggested will help, but I don't think it will be sufficient. Because this resolution was altered editorially, I would like to clarify what the conference hopes to obtain. We believe wholeheartedly in the concept of opening up our championships in team sports, but that's really a debate for another day. We need a study to determine what it would take to proceed in this direction and to draft legislation so the membership could debate and vote upon it next January.

The phrase "if appropriate" is one of the editorial revisions of the submitted resolutions. We believe that having the membership consider ways to provide fair access to our championships not only is appropriate, but is necessary. We ask your support for the resolution in hope that it will result in a concrete proposal next year. Thank you.

Noel W. Olson (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I urge your defeat of this resolution. In fairness, this body a few years ago decided that the regionalization concept was fitting for Division II because we couldn't prove throughout the nation who the best teams were and that we probably could do a better job in the regional concept. That was an effort for fairness, and I believe it was an excellent attempt to do that.

The philosophy of Division II over the many years in NCAA has been to bring forth the best possible teams, not to have it become an "all-comer's" meet—an NAIA-type mentality, and I say that kindly because most of us, like myself, rose from the NAIA. But it is not the concept of NCAA Division II to make it an "all-comer's" meet.

There has been a lot of criticism of sports committees. I think some of it is very unfounded. I would suggest that there needs to be an attempt to raise the level of the competitiveness of your teams at your particular institutions to allow you to have a better chance. If we allow this to go forth and have everybody automatically qualify, there will not be enough spaces in many sports. I know there can be things worked out for that, but there isn't going to be room for those at-large teams that come on and win a national championship, as one of our football teams did this past season. There is not going to be enough space.

There is one other thing. I don't know if this was in the changes, Lynn, but the word "interconference" competition, I suspect, is an error. "Intraconference" is what they meant to say there, because "inter" is not in the ball game anymore for Division II because of the regionalization concept.

The Championships Committee, which I happen to be a member of, has a lot of things that it wants to do and the championships restructuring group is going to study a lot of things to work for fairness. But I do not believe that we want to adopt an "all-comer's" philosophy in Division II. Thank you.

Anthony W. Norman (University of California, Riverside): In our opinion, Proposal 140 would not give all student-athletes equal access to NCAA postseason championships. Increasing the number of automatic qualifications in a region reduces the degree to which additional teams in strong conferences can have access to the athletics event first. Teams that have very strong records in competition but do not win their conference nomination

could very well be excluded from championship competition.

Certainly, we acknowledge the challenges in determining which additional team should be included in championship play, but certainly would hope that such a system would give consideration and better access to those student-athletes who are competing in strong conferences. Thank you.

David O'Toole (Bellarmine College): The last two gentlemen have actually debated the issue of whether we should have automatic qualifications. Our resolution calls for and asks the Management Council's championship team, which is going to give you a report after we finish with our legislation this morning, to consider the possibility of including automatic qualifications for each conference that makes up Division II. We are asking them to consider—that's the key word of number one—develop a championship structure. Also, in number two, it says "submit legislation, if appropriate." So, you are not voting on the issue. We are only voting on a resolution to ask the championships project team to do something that it's already been asked to do by the Management Council Transition Team—to study championships and to report back to Division II. You are asking to include the possibility of considering this, so I'm sure that they will consider automatic qualifications and expansion of brackets in their resolutions.

J. Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown): As was pointed out by other individuals, this would reduce the number of at-large opportunities and particularly reduce the number of at-large opportunities for independent institutions not in a conference.

We have some concern about a resolution that seems to recommend to those who are going to be making decisions of a particular option that favors automatic qualification for conference championships.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I would urge opposition to 140. While we're in the federation process and while the Championships Committee is meeting, I would encourage that we give them a chance to come up with some alternatives.

The thing that concerns me greatly about the resolution is the statement that in developing this we may accept no guarantee that all the expenses for all rounds of the championship would be funded by the NCAA. I don't know how the funding is on your campus, but it's a godsend to have that funding guaranteed as it is right now. I would certainly not want to send a message to the Championships Committee that would indicate that we would be willing to let that one go.

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): I'm going to speak in opposition to the proposal at this time, but I want to assure everyone everything will be considered as we deal with championships. For those of you who won't leave, there is a report we're getting ready to give you on the championship project team by Bob Becker that will be very, very informative.

But I want to assure you that our group is considering what is best for the division—how to get better access, how to get more student-athletes and institutions involved. So basically, the resolution does nothing because what the resolution is talking about doing the project team and current Championships Committee are currently dealing with it.

Thomas Gallagher (New York Collegiate Athletic Conference): I don't think the resolution is taking the Division II body in toto as making a recommendation that supports automatic qualifications for conferences. We have a Championship Committee to take up the issue. I'd like to read you the process: "All sports committee recommendations shall be processed

through the Championships Committee, then to the Management Council and are subject to the ratification to the Division II Presidents Council."

I think we have the mechanism in place to be represented and don't need this particular issue adopted by the Association.

Wallace Jackson (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I'd like to call the question.

[Resolution No. 140 (Page A-223) was defeated.]

Recruiting—Electronic Transmissions—Division II

Kelly J. Higgins (University of Alaska Fairbanks): I move Proposal 106. [The motion was seconded.]

I'll make an effort to be brief since this is the last proposal of the day. I made a few notes in support of this proposal that I wanted to read, but since this is the last proposal of the day, I believe I will dispense with them.

Proposal No. 105, as you know, was withdrawn from the Division I floor. The sponsors moved this proposal because in this age of advanced technology it is more cost effective to use facsimiles or e-mail to communicate with prospects than it is to send materials in the mail. However, these forms of communication do not replace the value of a telephone conversation. It is not intrusive. It is cost effective. It is good legislation. I urge your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-182) was adopted.]

Ms. Dorn: That concludes the voting on Division II legislation. At this time, we would like to continue the discussion forum relating to Division II transition issues and then have the final topic about championships presented by Bob Becker of the Division II championships project team.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): Point of personal privilege. I'd like to make a statement, please, about something that came up yesterday.

Yesterday morning when we were discussing the composition of the Management Council, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee expressed its concern about its absence on that body. In the afternoon, in response to a question to clarify that situation, we were given a very detailed explanation of why that decision was made as it was.

I inferred from that explanation that the Division I and Division III proposition to have student-athletes represented was somewhat symbolic and that Division II had struggled to find a much more effective, positive and hands-on way of having that happen. That may be very true and I accept and applaud the transition team's attempt to do that. However, I think sometimes symbolism does become significant and indeed, sometimes symbolism becomes much more than just symbolism. Sometimes it indeed becomes something very factual and something very effective.

Having functioned in a governance organization that for 10 years had student-athletes represented at every level, I can tell you that their impact was great, their impact was real and it was hardly symbolic. Those of us who are concerned about diversity on the Management Council and representation for women and minorities, would not be satisfied with a parallel structure that would allow us to meet with each other and then come together with the Management Council at a summit once a year in order to express our opinions from those two populations.

I believe that the concern—and I think perhaps to me it was the only tangible concern that was expressed in this structure—is the amount of time

that it might take for the student-athlete serving on that committee. That was the only point that I thought perhaps should have further discussion. I would suggest that a group of 21 or 22 student-athletes could serve in that other light and perhaps have representation on the Management Council. They could be rotated on a meeting-by-meeting basis so that two or three different student-athletes could attend each one. It would not put a great deal of demand on their time and yet would give that presence.

I really believe that for Division II it is critical that student-athletes be involved as this federated process moves forward. I would urge the Management Council, as one of its first actions of business, to reconsider its decision not to have student-athletes represented and that it work out some kind of mechanism to have that occur.

Their presence at your meetings is critical. The person sitting across the table from you cannot be ignored. Sometimes we tend to forget momentarily what our focus should be. I really think it's incredibly important that that happen. I would urge the Division II membership to urge that upon the Management Council. (Applause)

DISCUSSION

Ms. Dorn: Thank you, Sharon. Your comments are appreciated and they certainly will be noted.

At this time, we will begin the final presentation from the Division II championships project team. At this time if the members of the project team would please come forward. Bob Becker, Clint, Jerry and I believe Mr. Poppe is here from the NCAA, Dennis.

After the presentation by the Championships Committee, we do have a request for a waiver from one of our Division II members, so we would really appreciate your participation in that as well. Mr. Bob Becker.

Division II Championships Project Team

Robert T. Becker (Saginaw Valley State University): Thank you, madam. It's pretty well understood that we're going to be out of here about 12 o'clock. I can assure you that with the things that I have to say about what's already happened, that's a definite possibility.

It is my pleasure to serve as the chair of your Division II Championships Project Team and to be here this morning to update you on the deliberations of the committee to date.

First off, I would like to introduce the members of that committee and ask them to stand. The first member, Milton Bradley, is the faculty athletic rep at Delta State. Colin Cameron, who is right up here, director of athletics at Fairmont State. Margo Harbison is the director of athletics at Texas A&M. Jerry Hughes, director of athletics at Central Missouri. Shirley Reese is the senior women's administrator of Albany State. Barb Schroeder, director of athletics at Regis University. Two recently added members: Bill Lide, director of athletics at North Carolina Central; and Noel Olson, commissioner of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I have asked Jerry Hughes to join us because not only is he a member of our project team, but Jerry headed up the Division II Championships Committee for many years. Also Dennie Poppe, NCAA director of championships who handles Division II affairs, has joined us. I asked both of them to wear bulletproof vests, so fire away at us. Other members who I do want to identify as being very active on this committee are Lynn, Nancy Mitchell and Mike Racy. We've

only had one meeting, but the amount of work that these people do to keep us updated on what's going on all over the country is just outstanding, and we appreciate that.

Please understand that this committee has met only one time. It was decided at that meeting that our first plan of attack would be: one, to identify major issues relating to Division II championships and, secondly, to develop a list of other concerns of the division that will make the transfer from the old governance structure to the new governance structure a very smooth one. Thirdly, we adopted a philosophy that if it isn't broken, don't fix it. We will not be debating the issues this morning. We'll identify what the issues are for further study by the committee to be brought back to this membership for consideration. You received when you entered the session this morning a listing of those actions taken by the committee. I'm really not in favor of reading all of those, but I guess I have to say something about each one. I'll try to go through those. They are on the yellow sheets.

We agreed to look at the championship selection criteria that is currently being used by the Division II sports committees in the selection of your championship participants and especially to focus on the additional selection criteria that are not listed in the Manual.

Secondly, we agreed to take a look at the feasibility of establishing two subdivisions in Division II football. You saw a little bit about that information that we received yesterday as a part of the Financial Aid Committee report. We also agreed to look at the possibility of re-seeding teams once a Division II national field has been established. We also, as Noel alluded to in his comments this morning, agreed to take a look at the Division II regionalization concept. We also agreed to look at the championship bid and selection process, specifically the geographical proximity concept and deal with the possibility of the moratorium that currently affects championships in certain Division II sports such as ice hockey, field hockey and men's lacrosse being lifted well after the 1998-99 academic year. We also will look at the thorny issue of regional alignments and the concepts of proportionality and competitive balance.

The actual items that we dealt with are listed. We already have agreed to organize a meeting of the chairs of the Division II sports committees that will also include the Division II Championships Committee and selected members of the NCAA staff. The group felt that a meeting was imperative simply for the education and training for these committee chairs because so many times we're not all on the same page.

The third item—I think I can announce this — has only one hurdle left—the revising of some bracket sizes—to become actuality. They tell me it's a low hurdle and not a high hurdle. It's back to the Executive Committee and it looks as if this is going to happen. Let me tell you what did happen. We increased the women's volleyball bracket size from 28 to 32; baseball and softball from 24 to 32; and men and women's soccer from 12 to 16; at a cost of roughly \$350,000.

Number four, we agreed to ask the Executive Committee to specify that not more than one representative from the same conference serve as a voting member of a regional advisory committee. We asked the staff to contact all Division II sports committee representatives, whose terms were scheduled to expire September 1997, to confirm their interest in extending their terms by one year to provide continuity and transition to the new structure. The staff also was asked to coordinate the nomination process to fill any

vacancies on these Division II sports committees by August of 1997.

We asked the Division II Management Council to consider developing legislation to grant sports committees relief when extenuating circumstances exist for meeting the committee composition requirement of at least 50 percent athletics administrators. There was some concern about whether that would even be possible for some committees. The group also agreed to ask the Management Council to develop legislation and guarantees of regional representation on all Division II sport committees. Nancy, correct me if I'm wrong, this was done because procedurally if there was going to be input from the Championships Committee, it had to come in this order.

Finally, and this isn't on your sheet, but we have asked Dennie Poppe and his staff to prepare a primer on Division II championships. This primer will be a historical and definitive document on brackets and field size, selection and qualifying procedures, site selection criteria and other general information. We have seen a draft of this primer. It is currently being fine-tuned for distribution to the membership. You will find this document very informative and useful. Clint, I have to apologize because I told you that I had to introduce you and I forgot. Better late than never. I do want to introduce Clint Bryant, who recently was appointed as the vice-chair of the Division II Management Council. Is that the right title? We look forward to working with him. Clint was at our first and only meeting of this committee. Clint brings a wealth of information and knowledge about not only the championship structure but the general overall operation of the past Council experiences. Clint, stand up so we can see you again.

Robert T. Becker (Saginaw Valley State University): I apologize for not introducing you. That's pretty much what happened in our first meeting. You might wonder why we've only had one meeting when championships seem to be a very important issue to all of us since we spend a little bit of money in that area in our division. I can tell you that it was by design. Some of the other committees—the transition committee and project teams—needed to get their work done to push restructuring along. I will guarantee you that this committee will now get into gear and that it won't be too long before we'll have a lot more to report.

At this time, we'll open the floor to any suggestions that the membership might have relative to some issues that we have not identified. If someone wants to go to a microphone...

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): One issue needs to be addressed. We bought the regional concept. I think it's the way to go. In the sport of soccer, the smaller bracket has been a problem all along. My team was put in the west region by the regional committee and was picked third, which would have put us in the tournament. The national committee overturned that and moved the sixth-place team into the third slot. I have a real problem if all of us bought into the regional concept and the national committees are then overturning what happens at the regional level. I think that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Becker (Saginaw Valley State University): We appreciate your comments. That's exactly why we're going to take a hard look at that particular area. I can't believe that we've done this good of a job.

Marvin Vanover (Peach Belt Athletic Conference): I have one question and I'm sure it's implied in here when you talk about the responsibilities of the national committee. When we dip down from those chairs into the regional committee, as I understand it now, the regional chairs have the right to

select the other members of that particular committee. I would like for you to consider if that particular chair, whoever it might be, can come back to the conference and seek some input from the conference as to who might best represent them on the committee. Oftentimes, the regional people are not nominated or placed on these committees and back in the conference we don't know that until the fall before the championships manual comes out. I think we would feel more comfortable if we had an opportunity to have some input as to who would be representing our conferences on the various committees.

I have another question for clarification. You mention limiting the voting members of each committee to only one. Does this mean that the chair then would become a voting member of the committee or could you have the chair and a member from the conference who is a voting member?

Mr. Becker: We did discuss that.

As I said, we haven't come to any conclusion on that, but that was one.

Mr. Vanover: One other point. I'd just like to throw this out. Maybe you have already considered it. Committees are rating based on the number of teams we play in Division II, whether we played on the road, whether it's a win, whether it's a loss. We also give heavy weight for competing against top teams.

I would support the idea of selecting or rating teams on regional competition. This would encourage intraconference play. You might play a Division I school, which might take sympathy on you and beat you by 10 or 15. That division might beat you worse, yet in weighting it in that formula, you get an awful lot of weight participating against a Division I school.

In the interest of regionalization and encouraging more conference play, I would urge you to look at possibly eliminating consideration for Division I or NAIA in the rating formula. Thank you.

Charles A. "Tod" Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): On point number four, I raised this in the past with the committee at the meeting that we had. I served on a sports committee that's done it both ways—the chair has been nonvoting and another member of that conference is a voting member. I served as a chair where I've been the only member who voted and so forth. I thought that when it first came down after reading the second sentence: "May serve as a member of a regional advisory committee." I was concerned about that. Then I get this today. It says, "may serve as a voting member of regional advisory committee," which is what I advocated because I think it's a much, much better way to go. Then Marvin asked for clarification. You said you were still looking at it. Yet, when I read this, it leads me to believe that we can have two members from the same conference—one can be the nonvoting chair, the other can be voting. I'm happy with the way it's written if that's the way it's going to be. Could you clarify that?

Mr. Becker: Tod, the yellow sheet in my minutes is not the same. What I said is not the same as what's on the yellow sheet. That still has not been decided. It's still up for debate.

Mr. Eberle: I would strongly urge the committee to adopt what is on the yellow sheet. I think it's the best way to go.

Mr. Becker: Thank you.

James E. Harris (University of Alabama, Huntsville): May I ask for a clarification on the paragraph about the moratorium related to ice hockey, field hockey and lacrosse championships? Does this mean that if the mora-

torium is lifted, that the championship will continue?

Mr. Becker: I'm going to ask Dennie Poppe to respond to that.

Dennis L. Poppe (NCAA Staff): I think 1997-98 would be the last year that the championships could be conducted due to the fact that at the current time they do not meet the minimum sponsorship criteria. This is just a statement of fact that we acknowledge that and this issue has to be addressed because it is legislation. We have to develop some legislation to either continue the championship or make whatever adjustments we might need for a championship program. But no decision has been made regarding the status of that championship.

Mr. Harris: When do you think there might be a decision?

Mr. Poppe: That's hard to determine. I know it's going to be placed on the agenda and will be discussed during the next year, but we have a long time because, as I say, the moratorium is a year or two off.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): I think that all of us realize the significance that we place on championships in Division II as well as the concern that is expressed across the country from sport to sport about the various things that are part of this new primer. Are the plans now to have details to the point of helping to standardize the actual conduct of procedures and operations at the regional advisory committee level so it's much more of a cookie cutter process that we can use from sport to sport and regional advisory committee to regional advisory committee filtering up to the national committee? Are we going to get that detailed with the primer? Is that the plan?

Mr. Becker: That probably will come out before any final decisions are reached by the Championships Committee.

Mr. Echols: I encourage the championships project team to be as detailed as possible in developing a recipe on how teams are selected, who is involved in the committees, how you move from one committee to the other and how they actually conduct their business.

My experience in talking to a lot of folks across Division II is that those procedures are pretty much left to the discretion of those chairs and regional advisory committees. Therefore, we seemingly get inconsistency across the selection process in developing criteria and how they function, and how conference calls function and so forth. I think to have that in a cookie cutter approach would probably benefit us all.

Mr. Becker: Thanks, Doug. That's exactly right. That's a major, major issue. Hopefully, when we're all said and done here, when we start to wrap up at the end, that will be a byproduct of our deliberations. Okay, Clint.

Clint Bryant (Augusta State College): One of the things I think you are going to be very pleased with when you get the primer is that it's the best thing I have ever seen about Division II in how it lays down the groundwork and the history of how all of this started and where we are. It's a great document.

But, Doug, people like yourself can really help us when it comes to what your ideas are on these advisory committees and concepts because we are going to need the membership's input before we can make some decisions on what to bring back to the membership. I would encourage you once you receive the primer to pay close attention to the number of things there and then give us input back on what you think because that's going to be extremely important.

Mr. Becker: Thanks, Clint. The reason we want to get the primer out is

for you to see how it is now then to give us feedback into the little parts of that thing that could streamline it and make it better for all of us concerned. Certainly, the issue you raised, Doug, is one of those.

Bob V. Brennan (Wayne State University, Michigan): One thing needs to be looked at very, very carefully. I have been at Wayne State for over six years. The chairs of these committees have been in place for a long time, but we have never seen them in our area in the six years I have been there. It does make a difference. I think those things need to be passed around a little bit better than they are now. Thank you.

Charles J. Bertram (University of Southern Indiana): I have a question about item number four, which refers to the advisory committee. Does that mean that if you only have two conferences, that you only have a two-person committee?

Mr. Becker: I'm not sure that that means that. This is something that we're going to have to take a look at. Maybe it won't work. Remember, these are issues we're going to look at, not concepts we've already adopted.

Mr. Bertram: We urge that we have a larger committee to make a decision rather than entrusting that to only two individuals.

Mr. Becker: Thank you. Seeing no one else at the microphones, I want to thank you for your input and guarantee you that we will move ahead. Thank you.

Ms. Dorn: Thank you. We just have one more important item of business. A member institution would like us to consider a waiver if you could please remain, I'd be very appreciative of that. Thank you very much, Bob, and the committee members. Dennie, thank you for taking the time away from Kansas to be here.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division II business session heard a petition for a waiver of Division II membership from Quincy University. The waiver request was denied.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Dorn: We are now at the end of the Division II business session.

Mr. Becker: Before we get away from here, I think that in recognition of the fantastic job that this young lady has done, I think we owe her a ... (Applause)

Ms. Dorn: Thank you, Bob. Microphone number three.

Jerry Henderson (University of California, Davis): I'd like to briefly revisit the student-representation issue. I'd like to have the students who are in the room stand. Over the years coming to these meetings, including this one, some of the most lucid and logical arguments I have heard are made by students. We're here because of the student-athletes. We sometimes forget this. So I think it's important that they not only know what we do but are included in the process that we go through to develop the rules and regulations of the NCAA. I urge the division to rethink this whole question of student representation on all the committees and councils. I personally think there ought to be students on every group.

Ms. Dorn: Thank you, Jerry, I'm assuming that that is the request on behalf of the Management Council to evaluate thoroughly the role of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and it's relationship to representation?

Mr. Henderson: I don't care who does it, just do it.

Mr. Echols: I just wanted to assure the body that a great deal of discussion went into the legislation and the committee structure, which you had voted on and approved. Throughout those discussions—from every aspect and every person involved in that as well as review by the Management Council and the Presidents Council—there was full awareness of the importance that the information the student-athletes bring not only to the Convention, but brings to the whole process in Division II.

Without going into the detail that you heard yesterday from Adam Herbert, I would just simply say take a look at the structure of the student advisory committee involvement. When you look at the conference model that was used, there will be some 24 students involved in a yearly summit of issues in the areas that are important to students from across the country utilizing, if you will, your own institutional student advisory committee as sort of a feeder system into who might be selected from the various conferences to participate in that summit.

That group of 24 will also participate in the national Convention. Additionally, there will be opportunities where there are issues that tremendously impact the lives of student-athletes. As we know, for much of the legislation we asked them to participate in discussions that are important to student-athletes. I say all that not to debate the importance of student-athlete involvement or how that might happen. It's certainly been requested that we look at their involvement. We need to provide more opportunity for student involvement and yet be cognizant of the time demands. Perhaps having one or two student-athletes participating as a voting member of the Management Council is the answer. Division II has historically listened to its student-athletes. I can assure you at least in discussions that I have been involved in that that is a key element to any of the business that we would conduct in Division II.

Stormie Lynn Wells (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Northern Colorado): We want to express our gratitude for being looked upon so favorably. I think Sharon's comments were the best when she said that while we do have this representation of 24 student-athletes and that it's broad-based, that we would like to be in the room so that you can look us in the eye and we can look you in the eye as well.

Ms. Dorn: Thank you. Any other business on behalf of the membership?

Herb F. Reinhard (Valdosta State University): There was a report on ESPN this morning that they publicly announced that Division I was no longer going to be meeting with the small schools at NCAA Conventions. I was wondering if perhaps you could just maybe quickly tell us what our Convention will be like next year if this is indeed the case; just kind of a summary of what it's going to be.

Ms. Dorn: Herb, thank you. Nancy is perhaps more privileged to the information, but what I have heard is that Division II and III will meet on site in Atlanta a year from now. Our colleagues in Division I will also join us in that we will still participate in celebratory activities—the honors dinner, certainly the Honda Award, et cetera. They will at that time perhaps not meet in form with us anymore as divisions, but have opportunities for educational development and exchange of information amongst themselves at Division I. The composition of the group next year will be the same, but the agendas will be quite different.

Nancy has given me a sidebar here. There will be an opening session again

for everyone on Sunday afternoon, as we have in the past.

I would like to take this opportunity to certainly thank each and every one of you and to acknowledge my good friend, Noel Olson, the best possible retirement. Noel, you've been a mentor to me. You have certainly been a figure that I respected very much. On behalf of myself, North Dakota State University and the North Central Conference, I just wish you and Kathy the very best in your retirement. So thank you, very, very much.

May have I have a motion to adjourn? There is a second. Thank you very much.

[The Division II business session was adjourned.]

■ Division III Business Session

Monday Morning, January 13, 1997

The Division III business session was called to order at 9:45 a.m., with Division III Vice-President Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Belgiovine: Good morning. Welcome to today's Division III business session. Before we begin, I'd like to welcome all of our delegates, any guests who we have and particularly our student-athlete representatives of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

[NOTE: Various introductions and announcements were made and voting procedures were explained.]

I'd like to make a few comments and share some thoughts with you before the beginning of our legislative voting. Today's business session will be significant for many reasons and I think has been anxiously anticipated.

Last year, we witnessed the first steps in the formation of a new NCAA and a restructured Division III. This morning, we have the responsibility to continue that process. We will have before us legislative proposals that will redefine the very essence and nature of Division III. This will include the opportunity to adopt a new paradigm to govern our division and significant requirements to become and remain a member of our division. Our decisions will also deal with the discussion of the championships models. Decisions that we will make have the potential to affect the fundamental essence of the Division III championships experience for our student-athletes, coaches and administrators and the way that we relate to our Division III colleagues.

We have made tremendous progress during the last year related to restructuring, but our journey down this path is not yet complete. I urge all of you to participate to the fullest extent during the next two days because the scope and importance of the issues we will discuss cannot be overestimated and will affect us for many years to come.

I'd like to quote President Emeritus Ken Weller. He wrote an article recently in the "Athletic Forum." President Weller stated: "As new issues arise and circumstances change, the stable concepts and values underlining the summary of the philosophy should be applied to problems in order to shift the emphasis on existing policies and construct new ones." I urge you to keep the Division III philosophy in mind as we proceed through the next two days.

I would like to personally thank David Carter, who chairs the Presidents Commission, and all of our Commission members; the Division III Steering Committee members, who have made my job and my experience quite an enjoyable one; particularly Dan, Marybeth and all of the members of the NCAA staff. They do an unbelievable job of keeping all of us in place. I'd also like to thank our current committee members—we have asked them to do several things over the last year—and our student-athletes, who will be the beneficiaries of what we will do the next two days. All of those people have been committed to excellence and been committed to what Division III is about.

We are now prepared to continue our agenda and receive three committee reports. The first will be the Division III subcommittee report of the Presidents Commission. I would like to introduce President David Carter of Eastern Connecticut State University. David is chair of the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission. He also serves on various other NCAA committees, including the Joint Policy Board, the working group on NCAA Project 2000, the Commission Subcommittee on Minority Affairs, the Commission's Nominating Committee and the Division III Task Force on Restructuring. He has been a true leader for our division as well as the NCAA.

President Carter, please give us the Division III report. (Applause)

REPORTS

Presidents Commission

David G. Carter (Eastern Connecticut State University): Thanks, Bridget. First, let me say good morning to everyone. It's indeed a pleasure and an honor to be here and have the opportunity to report on the actions of the Presidents Commission during the past year.

As you would guess, we spent the majority of our time discussing restructuring issues, particularly the future of our division membership, as well as its governance and championship structure.

In regard to membership issues, we agreed to sponsor legislation that will address the needs of our provisional members as well as ensure that our institutions apply the principle of a broad-based athletics program.

These proposals appear in your Convention Notice as Proposal Nos. 54 and 55. We believe that these proposals will strengthen our membership. We encourage your support for their adoption.

We approved the Division III restructuring task force work related to the creation of a new Division III committee structure that we believe will establish a solid foundation for the future of our division's governance. The committee structure proposed by the task force appears in your Convention Notice as Proposal No. 28-B. Again, I urge your support for this important proposal.

As we enter these uncharted waters, our subcommittee has continuously stressed the importance of maintaining fiscal prudence in the governance of our division, including the administration of our championships.

In this regard, we have established guiding principles for the new Division III Budget Committee, including the idea that a substantial sum—I might suggest that might be at least 10 percent of the annual Division III budget allocation—be set aside for a Division III reserve fund.

As you may be aware, a significant amount of our time was spent on championship issues. We have worked closely with the Division III restructuring task force. We first approved championship principles identified by the task force. We then approved the task force's recommendation to implement basic enhancements to the existing Division III championship structure relating to team sports, other than football, in which sponsorship exceeds 200 institutions and in which the issue of championships access appears to be most acute. These enhancements will become effective during the 1997-1998 academic year. We believe this will greatly enhance the championships experience of student-athletes in these particular sports.

Much of our championships discussion revolved around a primary concern of how to achieve competitive equity between relatively large and small institutions. To this end, we asked the task force to develop championship models

that will attempt to address this particular concern. Later this morning, we will conduct an extensive championships discussion session that will include these particular models. I will have more to say about the Commission's perspective regarding these models when that discussion session takes place.

In the spirit of increased presidential involvement in the new structure, we agreed to forward to our colleagues and to other Division III constituencies an update of our actions and recommendations related to championships as well as governance and membership issues. We intend to continue this practice in the new structure as a means of educating and maintaining a cohesive membership with regard to our own governance. We also intend to explore alternative methods of communication, such as the World Wide Web and electronic mail list service.

Finally, we appointed President Curtis McCray of Millikin University to serve as our vice-chair during 1996 and reappointed him to serve a full term on the Commission. I might add that President McCray will also assume the position of chair of the Presidents Council for Division III in August.

We also appointed Judith Kuipers of the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, to fill an existing vacancy on the Commission. Just a few weeks ago, the Division III chief executive officers voted to appoint two presidents to serve on the new Presidents Council when it takes effect in August—John DiBiaggio of Tufts University and Ann Die of Hendrix College. My congratulations to Presidents McCray, Kuipers, DiBiaggio and Die.

If there are no questions, that concludes my formal report. At this time, however, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to four groups of people, and I would like you to join me after calling the names of the individuals in each respective group to recognize them for their hard, hard work.

[Note: Members of the Division III Restructuring Task Force, Presidents Commission and national office staff governance team were introduced and recognized for their work on the division's restructuring plans.]

Finally, let me personally thank you, the membership, for the opportunity to serve as chair of the Commission on your behalf over the past two years. It's been a privilege, but because of you it's become a love. You know, what makes me feel good is knowing that we value. We value that which we are committed to, and that is a fantastic philosophy. I'm convinced that the goal—to move forward with restructuring—is achievable. I'm also convinced that by continuing to work hard together, the future before us will be brighter than the past.

Godspeed. Enjoy the Convention. (Applause)

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, President Carter. I would also like to express my gratitude for the subcommittee's hard work and leadership during the last year. I would especially like to thank you and President Myers for your service and dedication as your terms on the Commission come to a close this summer. You have served the Commission and the division with distinction, and for that we are grateful. Please join me again in thanking Presidents Carter and Myers for their service. (Applause)

Our second report will describe the work of the Division III Steering Committee during the past year. It will be presented by Larry Schiner, director of athletics at Jersey City State College. Larry.

Division III Steering Committee

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): Thank you, Bridget. There is a substantial amount of important business to be conducted this morning, so as King Henry VIII of England said to each of his six wives, "I won't keep you

long."

On behalf of the steering committee, I would like to comment briefly on our work during 1996. Three major topics dominated our agenda during the past year—Division III restructuring, membership issues, including revisions of the institutional self-study guide, and the application of the Division III financial aid legislation.

As you would expect, a significant amount of time was spent on issues related to Division III membership restructuring. We affirmed our belief that conferences should continue to be permitted to vote on membership issues in the new structure, consistent with the division's one-vote, one-member institution philosophy. We also agreed to cosponsor with the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission a number of proposals upon which you will vote today related to restructuring. Those proposals are Nos. 26, 27, 28-P, 54 and 55. We urge your support on these important proposals that will help shape the future of our division. We also encourage your attendance and participation in the championships discussions following the voting on today's legislation.

With regard to membership issues and the Division III institutional self-study guide, we recommended that a reference to the issues of sportsmanship and ethical conduct be included in the guide as well as a reference to reflect the requirement that an on-campus student-athlete advisory committee be established at each institution. We also referred three recommendations from the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports to the new Division III Membership Committee. These recommendations are related to equitable access to sports equipment and sports medicine for male and female student-athletes and increased emergency medical care for practice and competition. We also gave careful consideration to a number of waiver requests related to our membership requirements and closely reviewed the status of our provisional membership applications.

We've spent a significant amount of time discussing the application of Division III financial aid. The steering committee expressed concern the legislation concerning this area is not being applied consistently by our membership.

It should be noted that these rules have changed little over the last few years. Accordingly, we forwarded a memorandum to the membership summarizing the application of Division III financial aid legislation and related procedures. We believe that the issue of financial aid will be the next major issue to be addressed for our membership once the championship issue has been resolved. Therefore, we agreed to forward this issue to the new Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee to begin to review whether our current legislation reflects actual Division III financial aid practices and existing financial aid regulations.

In other legislative matters, we urge your support for Proposal No. 72, which strengthens the Division III exception to the transfer-residence requirement. This proposal was sponsored by the steering committee, the Academic Requirements Committee and the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission. We believe this proposal will strengthen the transfer rule by precluding student-athletes who are not qualifiers from transferring from Division I to Division III only for the purpose of participation in a fourth season of competition. It also will preclude student-athletes from transferring simply to avoid the Division I and II satisfactory-progress requirements.

We also dealt with a number of routine agenda items, such as considering waiver requests of membership applications and reviewing legislation and interpretations that affect Division III.

Throughout the year, we made a concerted effort to inform the membership

of the work conducted by the steering committee as well as the work of the Division III Restructuring Task Force through a number of timely mailings. We hope that you've found this information informative and that it kept you abreast of the important issues facing our membership.

In conclusion, I am pleased to announce that during yesterday's steering committee meeting we appointed Stan Caine, president of Adrian College, to serve as the vice-chair of the Division III Management Council. My congratulations to President Caine.

I would be happy to entertain any questions you may have at this time. If there are no questions, that concludes my report. Thank you. (Applause)

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, Larry. It has been a privilege to chair the steering committee during the past year. Larry and another member of the steering committee, Ed Coll, president of Alfred University and our former Division III vice-president, will both complete their service on the steering committee at the end of the Council meetings in April. Larry and Ed have carried out their duties and responsibilities in an exemplary fashion, and the Division III membership owes both of you a debt of gratitude. Please join me in thanking these two Council members for their dedicated service. (Applause)

Our third report relates to the work of the Division III Championships Committee. You can just imagine how busy this group has been this year. Presenting the report on behalf of the committee will be Sam Bedrosian, director of athletics at Central College.

Championships Committee

Sam Bedrosian (Central College, Iowa): Thank you, Bridget. On behalf of the Division III Championships Committee, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this morning. This Convention marks the end of my term on the championships committee. I would like to thank the following members of the committee for all their fine work. Representing the Executive Committee, our leader, Bridget, and Dan Bridges from California Institute of Technology, who chaired our committee. Representing the Council, Linda Hopple from the Middle Atlantic States Athletic Conference and Bob Williams, director of athletics at Swarthmore College.

As you may be aware, the Division III Championships Committee meets three times a year and is responsible for reviewing the recommendations submitted by sports and rules committees as they relate to the administration of Division III championships programs. The actions of the committee are published in *The NCAA News* subsequent to each meeting. Therefore, I will not take time during this session to summarize all the actions the committee took.

During the 1995-96 academic year, a total of 7,401 student-athletes competed in 25 Division III championships, compared to 7,369 during the previous year. The increase was the result of the establishment of a Division II and III combined women's golf championship. Also, 67 percent of Division III members had at least one student-athlete compete in an NCAA championship. The success of championship programs is dependent upon the willingness and the ability of our member institutions to host events. At this time, I would like for everyone whose institutions hosted any round of an NCAA championship event during the past year to stand and be recognized. (Applause) Thank you.

As an editorial comment, we have found that there are fewer and fewer schools that are volunteering to host championship events, so those that do, we certainly appreciate their initiative. They have provided wonderful opportunities for our student-athletes. On behalf of the committee, I'd like to thank you for your com-

mitment to the championships program.

Implementation of championship enhancements initiated by the Division III Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure was the focus of the committee's work during the past year.

In addition to the enhancements of the seven team sports that have already been approved by the Presidents Commission, the championships committee recently recommended that the men and women's lacrosse championships each be expanded from eight to 12 teams effective with the 1997-98 academic year and that legislation be proposed to establish a Division III women's golf championship effective with the 1998-99 academic year. Of course, these recommendations must be forwarded to the Budget Committee, Management Council and the Presidents Council for final approval.

The committee has also been examining the use of regional or prequalifying systems in the sports of men and women's cross country, men and women's diving, men's tennis, and wrestling and will finalize its policies this May to bring more consistency to the championships programs and reduce the financial burden on participating institutions.

Finally, the committee has played an active role in providing information and feedback to the task force regarding alternatives to the championships structure, which will be discussed in the session later today.

During the coming year, the committee will be expanded from five to nine members, which will provide better representation of the membership. As part of its responsibilities in the new governance structure, the championships committee will be providing final recommendations to the Presidents and Management Councils for sports committee members, a task that was previously handled by the Men and Women's Committee on Committees.

It will be an exciting and challenging year, and the committee looks forward to working with the membership to provide a positive championship experience for every student-athlete. As always, we welcome your suggestions to improve the championships programs. We do read the correspondence you send to us. While we're not able to implement every item that is forwarded, we want to continue to work with you to make sure the championships program continues to provide a quality experience for our student-athletes.

If you have any questions regarding any actions taken by the committee, do not hesitate to contact me, any member of the committee or Donna Noonan, NCAA director of championships, who serves as staff liaison with the committee. Thank you, and that concludes my report. (Applause)

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, Sam, not only for the report, but especially for all of your contributions on the championships committee. Your insightful thoughts and comments kept us grounded in the Division III philosophy.

We are now ready to vote on the legislative proposals identified for consideration. We will begin with Proposal No. 26 found on Page 33.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division III Administrative Committee

Edward G. Coll Jr. (Alfred University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal establishes a new Division III Administrative Committee. It will function for our division much like the current Association-wide Administrative Committee, which has functioned very well.

It will consist of the leadership of the Presidents Council and the Management Council. The committee will be available to handle routine, noncontroversial matters like the filling of interim vacancies within committees that arise between meetings of the Management Council and the Presidents Council.

The committee would also be available to handle pressing issues that arise between meetings of both of those bodies. All actions of the Administrative Committee will be subject to subsequent review and approval of both the Management and Presidents Council.

The committee will also have a majority of CEO membership, consistent with the leadership role presidents will exercise in our new structure. I urge our Division III members to adopt this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 26 (Page A-34) was adopted, 300-0-0.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division III Management Council

John S. Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 27. [The motion was seconded.]

There are six components of this proposal that will improve the initial version of the Division III Management Council that was adopted last January.

First, the proposal will expand the size of the Management Council to 19 members by adding a second faculty athletics representative and two student-athletes. Faculty reps are critical constituents and deserve a second position on the Management Council. The addition of two student-athletes as full voting members will mean that the group that is the primary focus in Division III college athletics will have direct input into the management of Division III.

Second, the proposal ensures gender equity on the new Management Council by requiring its membership to include at least nine men and nine women.

Third, the proposal specifies that when the Council term of an individual who represents a conference or an independent institution expires, then an individual from that same conference or institution cannot be appointed to the Council as a replacement. This will ensure that the Council includes broad-based division representation. If this proposal is adopted, it is the intent of the sponsors that the time period between "same-conference" appointments be at least one year. The Division III Steering Committee is prepared to adopt noncontroversial legislation to that effect during its post-Convention meeting.

Fourth, the proposal assigns to the Management Council the waiver authority currently exercised by the Administrative Review Panel. This panel is slated for elimination in the new federated governance structure. The Management Council is the logical place to consider waiver requests.

Fifth, the proposal specifies that the Management Council will assume responsibility for the details related to the Division III business session at the Convention. These duties currently are exercised by the Executive Committee, which is being eliminated in the new structure. Of course, all business session details will be subject to the approval of the Presidents Council.

Finally, the proposal establishes a Management Council vice-chair. This position was inadvertently omitted from the Convention Notice, but appears on page two of the Convention Program. Among other responsibilities, the vice-chair will serve on the new Budget Committee. I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 27 (Page A-35) was adopted, 241-1-0.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—NCAA Committee Structure

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): On behalf of the Division III restructuring task force, Presidents Commission and steering committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 28-P.

[The motion was seconded.]

Joe Crowley's remarks this morning earlier outlined clearly what has transpired in developing this proposal in reference to committees. Proposal 28-P details our Division III governance structure in the restructured NCAA with reference to committees. It's a long proposal, as you see.

On January 2, the Division III restructuring task force, therefore, mailed to you an update regarding its governance and membership initiatives. This summary also included a four-page review of the new committee structure specified in this proposal.

In the interest of time, I'll assume that you are totally familiar with that document and its contents, but I would like to emphasize a few of the highlights of that document.

The new committee structure features eight key principles that derive from the Division III philosophy. They include: No. 1. The greater efficiency of the committee structure through elimination or combination of current committees whenever possible; No. 2. Single four-year terms for all committee members; No. 3. The staggered replacement of conference and institutional committee reps to encourage diverse membership representation in our committee structure. This includes a one-year hiatus or delay period so that committee representatives from a specific institution or conference cannot immediately succeed one another.

It also includes a commitment to equal gender representation on all standing committees, a commitment to ethnic diversity on each standing committee, the direct involvement of student-athletes in appropriate portions of our committee structure and the involvement of institutions of diverse location, enrollment, public and private representation and independent conference affiliation whenever possible.

The eight Division III committees created in Proposal 28-P reflect these principles. I'd like to add that the championships committee will have at least one committee member representing each of the four NCAA regions.

Regarding sports committees, the proposal will accomplish two significant initiatives. First, athletics administrators who also serve as institutional coaches must count as coaches in the makeup of sports committees in order to obtain greater administrative objectivity on sports committees. Second, the number of Division III representatives on several committees that administer Division III championships will increase to better administer these championships under the new federated governance structure.

In short, this proposal retains what we feel are the best features of our current committee system and establishes significant new features that will help our division make the transition to the federated governance structure successfully and efficiently. I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

Curtis L. McCray (Millikin University): On behalf of the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission, I urge the delegates to adopt this proposal. The Commission believes Proposal 28-P establishes a strong and progressive committee structure that will accommodate the current and future needs of Division III. This proposal represents extraordinary work on behalf of the task force and its governance subcommittee. I congratulate them on a job well done. Thank you.

[Part P of Proposal No. 28 (Page A-36) was adopted, 296-2-0.]

Division III Membership Requirements—Sports Sponsorship Requirements

Robert E. Williams (Swarthmore College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 54 on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will increase Division III sports sponsorship requirements from four men's sports and four women's sports to five sports for each gender. It will also increase team sports sponsorship requirements from two men's and two women's sports to three team sports for each gender.

The Council believes that this proposal is consistent with the Division III principle of a broad-based athletics program and with the 1996 Convention survey results that indicated the membership's strong support for increasing the current sports sponsorship requirements. This proposal has a delayed effective date of August 1, 2001, which will provide sufficient time for institutions to comply with these new requirements. There will continue to be a waiver process so that institutions may request a waiver of these requirements if needed.

I urge your support for the adoption of Proposal No. 54.

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): As some of you may recall, for many maybe even painfully so, I have long been an advocate for caution in legislation intended to increase required sports sponsorship.

Not too many years distant, when it was brought forward that this body adopt the current four-sport minimum requirement, I and other administrators voiced their concern about the ever-present tenuous athletics-participation situation at many of our urban institutions that are challenged by a significant enrollment of working men and women, the absence of on-campus competitive venues, underfunded budgets, a dependence on part-time coaches and an increasing adult student population outside the traditional 18- to 22-year-old.

I have been personally heartened and gratified by my many colleagues who have inquired as to the impact of the proposed legislation on our program. My public thanks is extended. I am pleased to state that currently we do offer, with the adoption of women's volleyball this past fall, five sports for women and five for men. However, I cannot irrefutably state that this circumstance may not be tenuous in certain years given the realities previously mentioned. I do believe that this legislation is well intended. What I would request is that those delegates whose opinion is not as passionate as some yeas or nays, that they abstain in their choice.

Should this legislation pass, when the time does come that an institution would request a one-time waiver without NCAA sanction, the deliberative body hearing this request might be reminded that there was not unanimity in any direction and would have a more compassionate ear for the realities of their colleagues who are striving for excellence in a challenging environment.

To paraphrase a prominent attorney, "If you must refrain, you must abstain."

Samuel R. Williamson (University of the South): The Division III members of the Presidents Commission strongly believe that this proposal will strengthen our membership's commitment to intercollegiate athletics. We urge your support. Abstention should not be an option on Proposal No. 54.

George C. Heider (Concordia University, Illinois): Just a point of information, if I might. If this provision were in effect today, how many members currently in Division III would be in violation?

Ms. Belgiovine: Approximately 49.

Mr. Heider: Thank you.

[Proposal No. 54 (Page A-117) was adopted, 242-44-18.]

Membership Requirements—Provisional Membership

Linda E. Hopple (Middle Atlantic States Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council believes that the establishment of an additional year in the provisional membership period will assist the Association's educational efforts related to these provisional members. Currently, there's a one-year period after which two years of full compliance is required. The steering committee has reviewed more than one example when the one-year educational period did not provide a provisional member with the time needed to be in full compliance during the final two-year period.

This proposal will benefit both provisional members and the Association as a whole by providing additional time and education for these provisional members. I urge your support for the adoption of Proposal No. 55.

Curtis L. McCray (Millikin University): The Division III members of the Presidents Commission believe that the proposal can only benefit our provisional members by providing them with adequate time to learn and to understand our legislation. As we enter the new governance structure, it is essential that our new members are fully prepared to join the Division III group. We urge your support for the adoption of Proposal No. 55.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference of Independent Colleges): We have 10 provisional members. This legislation will not influence us. I support very strongly what is being said in terms of educating the provisional members. I think that's absolutely crucial. I think it's absolutely crucial that that education focus on the highest ideals of Division III.

Now, having said that, just passing this will do nothing to achieve the goals. This is a change in 3.6. It specifically spells out in the bylaws what the privileges are and specifically focuses upon education in terms of the bylaws. But when you turn to those privileges that are necessary for education, you immediately discover that someone or some group has gone through the bylaws and has carefully removed every privilege, including the privilege that I am exercising right now, speaking in this meeting.

So relative to speaking in this meeting, 5.1.3.2 gives all provisional members accredited delegate status, but then 5.1.3.5 (b) immediately removes privilege to the floor and active participation. I went to legislative services and asked them if it was an error. They said no, that they intend that. They do not want provisional members in active participation at these meetings. How are we to achieve education if we are not treated as accredited delegates who have the privilege of the floor and active participation? Is there a possibility for education?

I remember very vividly Linda Hopple's speech last year listing the demands of Division III as we faced federation. So what I am going to do today is demand that there be first, from the staff standing up there, an educational program on all mandatory documents in Division III. It does not exist currently. Secondly, from the delegates assembled, there needs to be a mandatory effort to see to it that the bylaws allow, beginning with 5.1, the educational program that you are urging. I think it's going to be a wonderful thing, but you've got to do it and you've got to be very active at doing it. Thank you.

Ms. Hopple: I would like to make sure you're aware that the new Membership Committee is going to take a hard look at the concerns you have told us about. I think that you will be pleased to know that when they spend a lot of time on this, there will be considerable improvement. Thank you.

Joanne Merrill (Rivier College): As I listened to the previous speaker, maybe I shouldn't be speaking. We're a school that's in our third year of provisional membership. Although I think this proposal will pass, I'd like to speak in opposition to it as a school that's gone through the process. I don't think more time is needed. I think a true educational service is needed from the NCAA. As you go through the process now, we were kind of left out there to find our own way. I urge not for more time, but a true educational process for the provisional members as they go through their time period.

[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-118) was adopted, 235-59-9.]

Division III Exception to Transfer Residence Requirement

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 72-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit a student-athlete to transfer to a Division III institution and be immediately eligible for competition only if the student-athlete was academically and athletically eligible for competition at the previous institution at the time of the transfer.

It will require students who were not eligible at their prior institutions to fulfill an academic year in residence upon transfer. This would include students who were partial and nonqualifiers who exhausted their eligibility and students who were not meeting the satisfactory progress requirements of Division I and Division II.

The Council believes that this proposal will strengthen the Division III exceptions to the transfer residence requirement and is necessary to preclude student-athletes from transferring to Division III solely for the purpose of gaining a fourth year of eligibility. I urge your support for the adoption of Proposal 72-B.

Ginny L. Studer (State University College at Brockport): On behalf of the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 72-B.

This proposal requires student-athletes transferring to Division III institutions to be both academically and athletically eligible for competition at the institution from which they transfer before permitting them to be eligible for competition at the Division III institution they are transferring to. The current Division III transfer rule permits a student-athlete to transfer to a Division III institution if the student is academically eligible to compete at the institution from which he or she transferred, not taking into account the student who is not eligible to compete athletically.

For example, a partial qualifier or a nonqualifier from a Division I institution could be academically eligible to compete at a Division III institution, but not athletically eligible to compete if he or she has used the permissible three seasons of competition for a partial or nonqualifier at Division I institutions.

The Academic Requirements Committee urges the adoption of Proposal No. 72-B. Thank you.

Gordon A. Haaland (Gettysburg College): The Division III members of the Presidents Commission strongly support this proposal. We believe it is consistent with the Association's efforts toward academic reform and increased academic integrity. We strongly urge your support of this proposal.

[Part B of Proposal No. 72 (Page A-143) was adopted, 303-3-1.]

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 72-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will preclude student-athletes who have been disqualified or suspended from their previous institution for disciplinary reasons from transferring to Division III solely for the purpose of being immediately eligible for competition.

The current rule requires these student-athletes to fulfill an academic year in residence prior to transferring to Divisions I or II. This proposal will make this rule consistent for all three divisions and will prevent these student-athletes from using Division III as a loophole to avoid fulfilling the residence requirement at Divisions I and II.

I urge your support for the adoption of Proposal No. 72-A.

Gordon A. Haaland (Gettysburg College): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, the members strongly support this proposal. We believe it promotes our division's integrity and is consistent with the Division III philosophy on intercollegiate athletics. As has been noted, it is already a standard in Division I and II. Our standards should be no less rigorous.

[Part A of Proposal No. 72 (Page A-143) was adopted, 292-9-3.]

Maximum Contests Limitations—Division III Football

Timothy W. Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

Cedric Dempsey yesterday gave us two messages. First, always put the welfare of the student-athlete above the fear of the level playing field. Secondly, always put the baby above the crib.

This proposal does exactly both. If we fail to enact legislation because of paranoia or because of our own administrative inconvenience, shame on us. This proposal is good for the games that we play. It's good for the parents who come to watch their children play and, best of all, it's good for the student-athletes who play the games. Thank you.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): I would like to address the proposal on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee. During our meeting Friday, the steering committee again reviewed this proposal. It continued to have significant concerns.

First, despite the assurances of the sponsors, many of us remain opposed to the concept of counting fractions of contests for the purpose of contest limits. It simply will be more difficult and complicated to monitor whether or not a student participated in multiple portions of contests than to use the current rule, which is simple and straightforward. Make no mistake about it, accountability and record keeping will be significant factors for many Division III institutions if this rule is adopted.

Second, we are very concerned about safety issues related to these proposals. Seventy-six and 77 are similar. If 77 is adopted, it will be possible for a student-athlete to participate in portions of 20 football games. It would be possible for a student-athlete to participate in portions of 50 basketball contests if 76 is adopted. Many of them could occur in the same week. This rule would permit a greater amount of competitions during a more concentrated period of time. The steering committee worries about what the safety ramifications might be.

Third, where do we stop with the principle of counting partial contests? If we adopt this proposal and the basketball proposal, other sports with JV programs like baseball wouldn't be far behind asking us to count innings or outs or at-bats. What about the hardship rule? We don't count fractions of contests now for hardship purposes, but if this rule is adopted, you should be ready for requests to amend that rule as well.

Despite these concerns, however, the steering committee recognizes that the proposal attempts to address some legitimate concerns. Therefore, we voted to establish a special subcommittee to study the issue of maximum contest limits for student-athletes in more detail. This subcommittee will be charged with reporting back specific legislative recommendations regarding this topic by the July Management Council meeting for consideration by the membership at next year's Convention, if appropriate.

Accordingly, I move that Proposal 77 be referred to the steering committee for review as part of this process.

[The motion to refer was seconded.]

Curtis L. McCray (Millikin University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, we join the Council in urging the delegates to refer this proposal.

Yesterday, the Commission discussed this proposal thoroughly and believes there is perhaps merit, but that it also deserves further study. We should not address contest limits with a shotgun approach that affects only two sports. It is more consistent with our philosophy and makes much more sense to study this issue for all sports, as the steering committee suggests. The health and welfare aspects of this issue are significant and warrant careful review.

Contest limits are a crucial area of our legislation. We should not rush to change these rules until we are comfortable with the timing and the solution provided. Therefore, we recommend referral.

[Proposal No. 77 (Page A-148) was referred to an ad hoc committee of the Division III Management Council, 239-51-12, football schools voting.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Preseason Practice—Division III Football

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): On behalf of the ECAC, I would like to move Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think we need to take a moment to reflect on this because you have to be absolutely out of your mind to get up here with four oppositions to this amendment and not withdraw it, but I think there's a series of misunderstandings about it.

First of all, the preseason practice session or the first three days of noncontact were designed to allow players to become acclimated to practicing in intense heat. That was done without shoulder pads and helmets initially. Helmets were added subsequently to protect players from inadvertent contact. Divisions II and I a few years back adjusted that to include shoulder pads. They did this for purposes of protection rather than to attempt to beat the rule by having physical contact drills.

The point that I'm trying to make is simply that because of the federation and the way that was voted, it slipped through the cracks of Division III. I think it's incumbent upon us as administrators who are responsible for the welfare of our students to be absolutely sure, first of all, that we protect them as much as possible, particularly in this acclimatization period. Secondly, I think we jeopardize our universities from a legal perspective if two other divisions allow their people to wear protective equipment and we do not.

I beg your indulgence to reconsider this issue and to think in terms of what is best for the students and where we would like to go with respect to supporting our institutions. Thank you.

Antonio Coley (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Miami, Florida): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges that you oppose the adoption of Proposal No. 78.

As a Division I college football player, I can tell you from personal experience—because we already use shoulder pads during noncontact drills, something that we're trying to change—that as long as shoulder pads are involved, there's actually no real difference between contact and noncontact drills.

Statistics show that during contact drills the injuries do increase. Though they're intended not to be, shoulder pads are an offensive, not a defensive, piece of equipment. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee feels that a noncontact drill should be just that, noncontact. Thank you.

Dennis Wilson (Auburn University): I'm the chair of the competitive safeguards committee. I can't say it better than Antonio said it. When shoulder pads were allowed in Divisions I and II, they were allowed against the competitive safeguards committee's recommendation.

The reason for allowing shoulder pads at that time was to statistically reduce shoulder injuries during the noncontact practices. In fact, that has not happened. There's been an increase in injuries, as Antonio said, during the noncontact practices.

At many schools, there is actually no difference now between contact and noncontact. As a matter of fact, it should be called tackling and nontackling. They hit each other as hard as they can. I urge the defeat of this proposal.

Linda E. Hopple (Middle Atlantic States Athletic Conference): I speak in opposition to this proposal as well on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee.

The steering committee is very concerned that the use of shoulder pads during the three-day noncontact conditioning period will enable student-athletes to engage in activities close to "contact" and expose them to a higher rate of injury. As Antonio and Dennis have both said, we have in fact seen findings from the NCAA's competitive safeguards committee related to this current rule that heightens our concern. Thank you.

David L. Beckley (Rust College): The Division III members of the Presidents Commission oppose this proposal. It should not be necessary to wear shoulder pads on noncontact days. Wearing shoulder pads during that time will simply encourage real contact to take place. The argument that we should adopt this rule because it already exists in Divisions I and II also does not hold up. There are many aspects of football in the other divisions that we are better off without in Division III.

I encourage you to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

Mr. Carzo: I hate to let this thing go without a fight, but I see no logic in wearing helmets for protective purposes and not wearing shoulder pads.

I think all the logic that the people presented in opposition to this amendment applies in reverse order to the helmet issue, yet we deal with that. I think the point I'm trying to make is that we're misunderstanding the intent. The intent is to prevent injury by inadvertent contact. If we can't trust our coaches to do what's right, then I think we're responsible as supervisors to be out there on the field to check them.

Robert C. Deming (Ithaca College): As I look at this situation, my feeling is that it can be best settled by the football-only schools' vote. I hope those schools would vote their conscience.

Raymond E. Smith (Hope College): I'm a member of the football committee, but I'm speaking for myself.

Years ago, they introduced conditioning because they had done a study that 50 percent of football injuries occurred during the first week. Once they introduced the conditioning without pads, those numbers were reduced drastically.

I was the head football coach at Hope for 25 years. I'll tell you unequivocally, if coaches are allowed to use shoulder pads, the hitting will start on Day 1. I strongly encourage this group to oppose this. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 78 (Page A-149) was defeated, 40-146-2, football schools voting.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Preseason Practice— Division III Basketball

Glada C. Munt (Southwestern University, Texas): I move Proposal No. 75. [The motion was seconded.]

I was not prepared to make comments, but I'm moving this on behalf of the sponsors. This will allow basketball coaches to commence fundamentals on October 15 in addition to the conditioning activities.

Margaret E. Trainor (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Rosemont College): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes the adoption of Proposal No. 75.

I am a multisport athlete, like many student-athletes in Division III. Allowing on-court practice to start October 15 would be a disadvantage to these athletes because of the time conflict. Multisport athletes confronted with this overlapping of seasons may have difficulty focusing on their current sport. Furthermore, there are many Division III coaches who coach more than one sport. Student-athletes will suffer if their coaches are forced to divide their attention between two teams.

For these reasons, we urge that you support us in opposing Proposal 75.

Robert E. Williams (Swarthmore College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I ask you to defeat this proposal for two reasons.

First, the proposal would extend the time student-athletes are involved in actual basketball activities. The steering committee believes that the length of the current practice season is adequate.

Second, this proposal calls into question the whole issue of access to institutional facilities. The more that court time is reserved for basketball practice, the less time will be available to use that facility in other sports. Many schools are already struggling with tight schedules of their indoor facilities. This proposal could make that situation even more difficult. Thank you.

Irvin D. Reid (Montclair State University): I'm a member of the Presidents Commission. I won't repeat what Bob Williams has just said except to emphasize that the members of the Presidents Commission also oppose this proposal. Thank you very much.

Dick Kaiser (Olivet College): We also request that you vote down this proposal due to many of the points that were already brought up, particularly the double-sport athletes. This puts them at a distinct disadvantage. Also, there would be a facilities crunch as many Division III institutions attempt to keep JV programs alive. By moving the season up, we would have an unbelievable problem with many of our institutions.

[Proposal No. 75 (Page A-147) was defeated, 74-212-11.]

DISCUSSION

Ms. Belgiovine: We are now prepared to begin our discussions regarding the future of Division III championships. You all know this is a very significant and challenging topic. In this regard, we have assembled a group of very knowledgeable individuals who will help to lead our discussion over the next few hours. Once they are done, we encourage your participation in the process. As most of you know, the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission has played a central role in the evolution of the championships issue during the

last few years. This makes perfect sense, of course, as we have adopted and now will implement a governance structure in which CEOs will assume the ultimate leadership of our division.

Because this central role will continue, we have asked the chair of that group, President David Carter, to make some opening comments to help frame our discussion. President Carter.

David G. Carter (Eastern Connecticut State University): Thanks, Bridget. I appreciate this opportunity to say a few words about the upcoming discussion. We are about to begin an extremely important exercise.

Championships are important to all of us. Of course, one of the reasons is that championships success reflects on the reputation of our school and its athletics program. But I think we all might agree that a more important reason we care so much about championships is that they directly affect our student-athletes and the overall quality of their collegiate experience. As we begin this discussion today, I challenge each of you to examine why championships are important to you. Think about the role championships play in the overall philosophy of your athletics program and your institution. Then ask yourself if that philosophy is consistent with the Division III philosophy statement. The philosophy statement is found on Pages 434 and 435 of the NCAA Manual. It also is displayed on the overhead screen.

Let us not forget that we began our restructuring discussions a few years ago with a commitment to use the Division III philosophy statement as the foundation of the restructuring of our division. That philosophy statement is just as useful in the discussion of championships issues as it was in the creation of our new Management Council and the establishment of our new membership requirements.

In late November, I forwarded to you a memorandum that updated you on the status of our championships discussions. The memo described in detail the three championships alternatives that we will review and vote on today.

I ask you to review this information carefully and to discuss it with your colleagues. I am confident that you have fulfilled this particular charge. I can assure you that the Division III members of the Presidents Commission Subcommittee will pay close attention to today's discussions and straw vote.

The Division III Presidents Commission Subcommittee believes that change is needed. It is important for you to provide us with a sense of your thinking. This issue has resurfaced time and time again on our agenda during my years on the Commission subcommittee and often has dominated our discussions. We feel the time is fast approaching for us to reach closure on this issue. We intend to review today's discussions and straw votes as we chart our course regarding Division III championships during the next year and beyond.

After the presentations and discussions end this afternoon, you will be asked to cast two votes. The questions are relatively straightforward: Do you favor the development of a championships model beyond the Division III championships enhancement package? You will hear about the enhancements package in detail today. Keep in mind that it already has been approved by the Commission for implementation beginning next year, so this question simply asks should we develop a model that goes beyond the enhancement package. The second question is this: If a championships model is developed, which of the two models do you prefer, the subdivision model or the subgrouping model? You will also hear about these two models in detail today.

The Commission intends to use the results of this second vote to select either the subdivision or the subgrouping model for formal consideration by the mem-

bership at next year's Convention. So this question simply asks after all the information you have seen or heard about in these two models, which do you prefer? Accordingly, you will help the Commission to determine the ultimate structure of Division III championships. Please accept my thanks in advance for helping us carry out this important responsibility. At this point, I would like to ask President Jim Appleton to come to the microphone and moderate the rest of the discussion session. Jim.

James R. Appleton (University of Redlands): Given the amount of detail that has accompanied our actions this morning, you can see why championships are very important to us and why it's necessary, given the other work, that this conversation continue for another year.

We do have an important task today. We will be restricted to some degree by time. I will do my best to keep us on task. In that regard, we'll limit the three presentations to the time that has been designated. I think we will accomplish a lot. This afternoon, we will have opportunities for conversation and then a straw vote.

President Carter referred to the November championship mailing. I can't overemphasize the importance of that document. It should be the foundation of today's discussion sessions and straw votes. If you need additional copies of this document, they are available at the base of the dais here. I would urge you to take a look at that because it does outline these various options in some detail.

Before we go any further, I would like to note the other task force members. You already have heard from David Carter and Bridget Belgiovine. The other task force members are: Jeff Ankrom, faculty athletics representative from Wittenberg University; Kitty Baird, senior woman administrator, Centre College; Dennis Collins, executive director, North Coast Athletic Conference; Mary Jo Gunning, director of athletics, Marywood College; John Harvey, director of athletics, Carnegie Mellon University; Linda Hopple, executive director, Middle Atlantic States Athletic Conference; Linda Moulton, director of athletics at Clark University; Dick Rasmussen, executive director, University Athletic Association; Judith Sweet, director of athletics at the University of California, San Diego; and Bob Williams, director of athletics at Swarthmore College. Thank you. I also want to identify the most important staff member, Donna Noonan. Donna is director of championships at the national office and is the staff liaison to the Division III Championships Committee. I believe we should acknowledge you and give you thanks for all your hard work. (Applause)

You've heard President Carter refer to the importance of the Division III philosophy in the consideration and resolution of the championship issues that face us in Division III. I concur with his statement. I hope you will also listen and react to today's discussion not only with that philosophy in mind, but with having an ear to what is best for Division III as well as what is best for your institution and your conference. This is difficult to do, but we urge you to take that into account.

I would also like to place today's discussion into context. I think just about everything you will hear today regarding championships alternatives will reflect an attempt to address at least one or more of the following three issues. These issues are: Championships access, membership growth, and commonalities.

First, a comment about championships. Championships access is an increasingly coveted item. As David Carter noted, championships not only benefit our student-athletes and our institutions, they do cost additional dollars. As we expand and often increase time demands on our participating student-athletes in Division III, we must keep championships access in perspective. How much

access is reasonable is a very important question for us to continue to ask.

Second, with regard to membership growth, we can expect further growth in the near future with approximately 400 total members in two years if all of our current provisional members complete their provisional process successfully. Is further growth on the horizon? For now, the membership moratorium that is being referred for consideration is likely to pay attention to that. Nevertheless, we have to ask the question: Can we accommodate growth in the future?

Three, commonalities refer to the institutional similarities that keep us together as well as diversity that exists within our division. You are all familiar with some of the criteria that can be used to reflect that diversity, including undergraduate enrollment, sports sponsorship and public/private affiliation, but other differences exist, including institutional mission and admission standards. It seems that diversity has increased with the growth of our division. It also is reflected to some extent on the championships playing field. How comfortable are we with this diversity? What, if anything, should we do to our championships structure to account for this diversity?

These three topics are important as we consider the future of our championships. Championship access, membership growth and our commonalities as well as our differences are all difficult issues, made all the more challenging because they are interrelated. You will hear in detail about three models to address these issues. They are enhancement models—the subdivision model and the subgrouping model. In some respects, these models are similar, but in many respects, they are very different. Each represents a good-faith effort to modify our championships structure to address these issues of access, growth and commonalities, and, of course, the first of these goes into effect this coming year. They were developed by the Division III restructuring task force in consultation with the Presidents Commission and will be a basis of our discussion for the rest of today.

Before we begin to examine each model in detail, we should review from a process standpoint what will happen with the results of today's discussions. To review this topic with you is Bob Williams, who has served as chair of the task force subcommittee on championships. Bob, if you would comment on these matters before we proceed.

Robert E. Williams (Swarthmore College): I would like to briefly review how we believe the championships structure issues will evolve over the next year.

After tomorrow's Division III business session concludes, the restructuring task force will conduct its final meeting. During that meeting, we will carefully review and discuss the results of today's discussions and straw votes. We will attempt to identify work that needs to be done, which group within Division III will be responsible for doing that work and what the associated time line should be. We already have the answer to some of these questions. The bracket-enhancement model already has been approved by the Championships Committee, the task force and the Presidents Council for implementation beginning next academic year. In essence, this is a done deal. The enhancements will be implemented in 1997-98. Then it will be up to the sports committee in each of these seven sports to determine how the enhancement model should best be implemented in that sport. Some of this work already has begun.

The newly expanded Championships Committee will directly oversee the process. Obviously, it's going to have to be on a fast track. You also have heard and read that the Presidents Commission wants the membership to have the opportunity to go beyond the enhancements model and have a chance for a formal vote on either the subdivision model or the subgrouping model. We want to

allow for this possibility at our next Convention. That means that the task force will have to review the results of today's straw votes and develop one of these two models in much greater detail if that is warranted by today's straw vote. Critical details like bracket sizes and exact cost estimates will have to be determined.

The Championships Committee will have the overall responsibility of working out these details and reporting this information to the steering committee, Presidents Commission and you, the membership. It is likely that the committee will need some current task force members who have assisted in developing these models to serve as consultants in this process. Given legislative deadlines and our leadership's meeting calendars, it appears that the Championships Committee will need to resolve these details by May to have this information ready for the presidents in June.

Therefore, if today's vote indicates that it's necessary, our goal will be to have a well-defined subdivision or subgrouping model established by the summer. We believe this will permit ample opportunity for a thorough review and discussion of this model by the membership in anticipation of a formal vote at the 1998 Convention. Thank you.

Mr. Appleton: As you can tell, there's much work yet to be done if we move on that schedule and toward voting on a model beyond enhancements. What will happen with the results of today's discussions will have a real impact. To review this topic, we need to hear from the members representing the three different models. We want to begin reviewing, but I have some details that I need to work through first so that we set the ground rules, then we'll move ahead.

Three task force members will review each of the three models. Each group has been allotted 15 minutes for its presentation. That should take us to approximately 12:30, when we will adjourn for lunch. I'm going to indicate when there are two minutes remaining on these 15 minutes so that each of the groups understand that we want to keep very close to this time line. Please hold your questions regarding each model so that we can complete the three presentations. There will be plenty of time for questions and discussion this afternoon.

The staff also has distributed a white form that you can use to submit key questions regarding the models. We will attempt to identify the most common questions and be sure to address these during each break-out session. After lunch, we will reconvene in one of the three break-out rooms to discuss the models in further detail. One of the three task force members you hear from this morning will attend each of the break-out sessions as a resource person. We also will have a task-force member moderate each session and have a staff member in attendance to assist as necessary. It is our hope that breaking into smaller groups will foster more dialogue. We urge you to take advantage of this unique opportunity to have your questions answered or responded to as you look at each of these models.

For purposes of fairness and convenience, we have randomly assigned institutions and conference administrators to one of these three rooms alphabetically. The staff has been distributing these lists of institutions. Each list has a different color.

We have just concluded all the instructions that sound more like seventh grade to me than this Convention. Nevertheless, I hope that's very clear. The break-out sessions will last an hour, no later than 2:45. We will reconvene here no later than 3 and engage in some general discussion for approximately a half hour. We will then conduct two straw votes regarding the models. We'll adjourn no later than 3:45 so you are able to attend this afternoon's general business ses-

sion.

Our first presentation will relate to the bracket enhancements model that will be implemented this year. John Harvey, Linda Moulton and Judy Sweet will make this presentation.

Linda S. Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): The issue of championships for Division III has been around since the early '80s. Over the past 15 years, we have gone from sponsoring championships that were not fully funded to the block-grant concept, to the restoration of transportation and per diems to a review done in the early '90s that determined bracket size by the percentage of members sponsoring a sport and to now, restructuring.

Talk about restructuring for Division III has also been around a long time, long before it became an Association-wide issue. Our size as a division, our diversity, our perceived philosophical differences have continued to raise questions about the appropriateness of staying together as a division. Those discussions escalated when we feared there might be a significant influx of new members into Division III that would create further strain. With Association-wide restructuring comes increased federation and the opportunity to make decisions based upon our needs and priorities that are reflective of our philosophy and principles. In essence, to do what is right and best, to better determine our destiny.

The responsibility of the task force has been to determine and articulate the issues and offer suggested solutions. We ultimately defined the issues, as already stated—membership growth, commonality and access to championships. Early on, the concerns focused on membership growth and commonality, but quickly moved to championship access. We have taken significant steps as a membership to address our concerns about growth and commonality—our provisional membership category, our moratorium on accepting new members, the legislation just passed regarding sports sponsorship and adding another year to the provisional membership category.

At the same time, the task force and Presidents Commission developed a set of guiding principles regarding the championships that helped direct how we would proceed. We requested that the sport committees review the bracket sizes and submit recommendations based upon three key guidelines: 1) To use the previously established championship ratio of 1 to 8 to 1 to 12 for team sports championships and 1 to 16 to 1 to 24 for individual-team championships; 2) To apply the ratio consistently and; 3) Our intent would be to fully fund the championships consistent with the ratio.

At last year's Convention, the task force presented an update about where we were at the time, shared information and recommendations from the sports committees and distributed a survey that addressed the issues of membership requirements and championships.

The survey responses represented approximately 60 percent of our membership. What we heard from you regarding the survey included the following: Championships should be fully funded. The focus should be on team championships.

There was strong interest in providing additional opportunities for postseason play. A substantial portion of the membership wanted to take action to increase access to championships and make the championship fields more homogeneous. In summary, subdividing and subgrouping had substantial support and substantial opposition, suggesting that other alternatives needed to be explored.

The survey results provided direction to the task force over the past year. Our objective was to develop a series of models that would present options initially to the presidents and ultimately to the membership. That certainly is no small task, given the numerous considerations that we felt needed to be addressed—

adhering to the sports sponsorship ratio, conducting championships within a three-week period, sensitivity to the number of consecutive days of a championship, regional versus interregional play, geographical groupings, public versus private, the importance of conference affiliation, access versus quality.

Ultimately, the task force developed three championship alternatives. The first kept the division together, but uses a consistent ratio, as I previously mentioned, in those eight team sports with sponsorship of 200 or more and retains a single national championship. Applying the ratio consistently and adhering to our desire of fully funded championships, we expanded the bracket sizes in six of the eight team sports, providing us with a total of 68 additional opportunities. While basketball went from 64 to 48, it will provide a fully funded championship consistent with the ratio applied to all the other sports. Increasing the bracket sizes has become known as the "enhancement model."

The second uses an index with enrollment and sports sponsorship, subdividing the division and creating two national championships. The third, to divide the membership into four homogeneous subgroups with a playoff between the subgroups for a single national championship.

Following considerable discussion and debate about the merits of each option, the task force felt that many of the concerns about access and opportunity would best be addressed by staying together as a division and expanding the number of brackets in a model that has been appropriate and successful.

The task force recommended to the presidents that the championship enhancement model be implemented beginning 1997-98. I do think it's important for you to know that there were several points that ultimately led us to our decision to keep the current model with the additional brackets. Those points were: 1) The individual sports needed to be included; 2) Further consideration needs to be given to football; 3) Two-hundred institutions with sports sponsorship may not be the magic number; 4) We needed further discussion on subgroups versus subdivision; 5) We needed to plan out what the brackets would look like in each model; 6) There were concerns about the implication for governance; 7) There was also concern about the impact of automatic qualifiers; 8) We felt we needed an opportunity to give the enhancement model a chance.

The presidents accepted the task force recommendation, but have asked us to do further fine tuning so that the membership would have an opportunity to discuss all three models at this year's Convention and to determine our future direction.

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): Thank you, Linda. I'd like to say at the outset that working with the task force on restructuring the NCAA has been an exceptional experience for us all. We have become very deeply involved in the consideration of what the philosophy of Division III is and how we can best manifest these principles in the new governance system, the improved membership requirements and the improved and enhanced championships system.

In considering what the best championships model for this division is at this point in our development, I would strongly urge us to keep clearly in mind the broad picture of the interests and needs of college athletics and of Division III. I believe we should consider these factors above and beyond access to post-season play and beyond what particular institutional interests may suggest. There are more fundamental considerations inherent in this issue for the entire division.

I'd like to outline briefly for you five major reasons why I believe strongly in this enhancement model.

The first is that we need this ability in this time of major transition for all three divisions. We have a well developed and a well tested championship system now. We have improved it. We have increased access. We should continue with this as we move on to untested ground in other areas of our restructured system.

The second major premise is that the size of this division is a considerable strength. We are the largest single group of institutions sponsoring college athletics, 400 institutions under a single statement of coherent philosophy. Why diminish or reduce this strength by subdividing or subgrouping?

A third major related point here is the benefit of independent institutions in our membership. You may or may not know that 100 institutions of our 400 institutions—one-quarter of our membership—are not affiliated with conferences. Many have a difficult time scheduling and gaining representation for their interests at various levels. To narrow the field, to split the division, to narrow the pool through subdivision would make scheduling more difficult and more costly for these independent institutions.

This leads to a fourth basic certainty that I feel strongly for all of us as members of Division III—that separation or division of our membership and the resulting polarization would weaken us. Drawing clear and heavy lines within our present membership would compound and increase the difficulties created by federation. We should not put ourselves in the situation of competing with one another between subdivisions for championships funding, for good championships sites, et cetera.

My final point of consideration I think reflects back to what Jim Appleton said a little bit earlier. The diversity of our membership is a unique characteristic and a strength of Division III. We should retain and promote this diversity, not try to separate out certain types from other types. We are diverse, but we're all unified under a principle of no athletics scholarships. Our diversity is a strength for the same reasons that diversity in other populations is a strength.

Again, I would urge that we emphasize these aspects of the broad picture over narrower considerations in order to maximize our strong position. Judy Sweet will now conclude our position.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): Good morning. It's a pleasure to be with you. I've just been informed by our timekeeper that I have four minutes. That's the problem with being last to bat, but I will try to do my best to share with you some insights based on my experience as Division III vice-president, secretary-treasurer and president. I will try to be as concise as possible and save any other remarks for the discussion phases.

I had the opportunity and the privilege to address you two years ago at the 1995 Convention. We were talking about the ramifications of potential governance restructuring for the Association. At that time, I indicated to you my reservations on whether restructuring was in the best interests of the entire Association. Those reservations have not gone away, but the decision was made. As a result, we need to do the best that we can for our division with the hand that has been dealt to us. I hope that today's discussions will allow for the opportunity to share information, to share facts, to reduce the potential for misunderstanding and assumptions.

In 1995, the questions that were asked in our discussions about governance, particularly pertaining to championships, were the following: Is Division III too large? Is there an ideal field size for championships? How can diverse institutions best be accommodated in Division III? How do we plan for the increase in size in Divisions II and III as more NAIA members join the NCAA?

I believe that the results of the work of the task force indicate what is right

for Division III at this point in our history, and I underline "at this point in our history." The task force has worked diligently. I think the results of the legislation that it's proposed to you indicates that it has been very thoughtful.

The advantages, in my opinion, of enhancement include addressing access by increasing bracket sizes, maintaining regional competition and allowing institutional autonomy as far as what division institutions believe they best fit within the NCAA. There is unity based on a common philosophy. It keeps things uncomplicated. Any dramatically different approach needs careful consideration to fully understand the implications to members, student-athletes, funding, NCAA staffing and the overall administrative structure. If we are going to make changes, we need to make changes for the right reasons. A number of years ago, when there were some concerns about participation in the Division III football championship, there was a slogan and button that read "III for III." I would encourage you to please keep that in mind as we consider the direction we will go in the future.

Finally, the new governance and enhanced championships program is just beginning. Please give it a chance. This is the first step. Evaluate it. Adjust, if necessary, and keep in mind the importance of unity. Thank you.

Mr. Appleton: Thank you, Linda, John and Judy. Our next presentation will describe the subdivision model and will be given by Jeff Ankrom, Kitty Baird and Dennis Collins.

Jeff A. Ankrom (Wittenberg University): Thank you, President Appleton. You've heard plenty of background, so I'm not going to spend a lot of time giving you more background information. But we think that it's important that you understand well the subdivision and subgrouping models. That's important because this is different, as has been emphasized earlier. The enhancement model is with us. It's an accomplished fact. So the models for this next pair of presentations are important.

I'm going to talk about the technical parts of the model. Dennis is going to tell you about the championships structure under a subdivided NCAA Division III. Kitty, our cleanup batter, is going to talk about the advantages and disadvantages. First, I would ask you to, of course, keep in mind the basic principles that others have referred to, but also those that are referred to on the first page of your subdivision handout. I won't read them to you. I think they're very clear. I want to spend my time talking about how this model would work.

As is the case with both the subdivision and the subgrouping model, enrollment and sports sponsorship are the criteria that will help us make the decision about where your institution fits into the two subdivisions labeled A and AA in this proposal. The basic information is in your handout, but I prepared a table that may help you understand the relationship between enrollments and sports sponsorship in this proposal. Five hundred and 1,000 are important enrollment cut-off levels in this proposal.

Looking at the chart you see on the overhead, it would be fairly simple to look at your female enrollment, your male enrollment and see which of these cells you fit into. For example, if your male and female enrollments are both 1,200, you would fit into this ninth cell matrix that you see on the overhead. Then you would automatically go into subdivision III-A. In six of these cells, it is enrollment that determines where you will fit into the subdivided NCAA Division III. In the other three cells, we need to consider sports sponsorship. So if you're in the intermediate categories—your male and female enrollments are both between 500 and 1,000—the second criteria needs to be applied.

The second determinant in this model is the level of sports sponsorship. The

handout tells you how this works, but let me give you a simple example. Let's suppose that you sponsor eight women's sports and seven men's sports. Seven, the lesser number in this case, is your level of sports sponsorship. If your level of sports sponsorship is greater than five, you would move into subdivision III-AA. If your sports sponsorship level is less than six, III-A is your subdivision in this model.

That concludes my part of the presentation. I'd like to turn it over to Dennis.

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): Thank you, Jeff. My part in this presentation is to explain how the mechanics of how each subdivision will operate with two concurrent national championships and what some of the benefits of that system would be.

To keep it brief, I'm going to use just two examples—football and soccer. Football, as it is described in the November mailing that you received, will provide for two national championship fields. As you know, we currently have only 16 teams involved in our national football championship. It cannot expand under the current system because of time restraints that we have established. Under the subdivision plan, two championship fields will be created. In Division III-A, where 64 football teams will play, an eight-team field will be created. That will be a new eight-team field. That championship ratio works out to a perfect 1-to-8 ratio, as is the ideal set by the Division III leadership. In Division III-AA, where 135 schools play football, the current 16-team bracket would be applied. This ratio of championship berths works out to another ideal 1-to-8 ratio. This new system could provide much greater access for our 200 football-playing schools that currently are constrained by a 1-to-12 ratio.

Immediately, eight more berths could be provided for deserving teams to participate in a national football championship. This is our most critical sport in terms of access. With 19 additional teams coming from provisional membership over the next two years, the ratio in football will grow to 1 to 14 by 1998. Additional deserving teams may be left out of the championship if the subdivision plan or something similar to it is not adopted.

Soccer is another example. Men's and women's soccer have nearly identical sports sponsorship at 327 institutions. Currently, a 40-team championship field is being planned for next year. Under subdivision, Division III-A will count 129 teams and a 16-team championship field reflects a 1-to-8 access ratio for that field. At the same time, Division III-AA will have its national championship with a 24-team field, representing 198 institutions, with a good 1-to-8 ratio. In addition to providing the same access under the current system, or more in the case of football, subdivision provides a real bonus not available under the current system.

By reconfiguring the current championship fields into two national championships, the subdivision model actually cuts the number of contests. As a result, the amount of travel time and missed class time for our student-athletes in Division III—I think President Appleton did mention this as far as how much access we can afford to have in Division III—which has historically been what we have considered the academic center of the NCAA. This is done while maintaining the same championship access that currently exists. We would not be reducing that. Without subdivision, our single national championship fields will continue to spiral upward, increasing contests and the amount of time to complete them.

This plan will be good for our current members and our new provisional members, also. Thank you.

Kitty R. Baird (Centre College): Thank you. My part is to now talk about why

we should go with subdivision. In considering this proposal, let us keep in mind the Division III philosophy statement throughout, which encourages student participation while maximizing the number of athletics opportunities and emphasizes our support of student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics performance, including opportunities for participation in national championships by providing all teams appropriate competitive opportunities.

Subdivision provides two manageable national championship fields. This would be a change from the one very large field with its constant spiraling of bracket sizes. Subdivision allows for championship fields to remain at a ratio of 1 and 8 to 1 and 12 while at the same time reducing the size of the fields. With fewer teams in each championship, fewer games would have to be played to reach the finals while allowing fewer classes to be missed. In fact, this could eliminate a mid-week game or one weekend of competition in all eight championships except possibly softball, baseball and Division III-AA football. Softball and baseball would have fewer games and Division III-AA football would remain the same, but would provide an opportunity for more teams to participate without extending the length of the championship.

Subdivision recognizes current and future growth patterns and provides for that growth in a manner that already has precedent in NCAA Division I football with the I-A and I-AA divisions. As membership in Division III grows, it will be easy to expand bracket sizes without over-extending the length of the championships. This model would also be used at some future date for individual sports or other team sports with high sports sponsorship. This encourages participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for our student-athletes from different-sized schools.

Subdivision accommodates the ever-widening differences in athletics programs and institutional enrollment size. This supports our philosophy statement that the purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members in developing the basis for consistent, equitable competition while minimizing infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs. Subdivision with two national championships will provide for the top teams in each division to meet at the pinnacle, thus allowing for true national championships. This provides a more positive experience for student-athletes by matching teams of institutions that are more nearly alike in size and sports sponsorship all the way through to the finals of the national championship series.

Subdivision provides for two comparable groups of schools. Subdivision does not separate all state schools into one subdivision. Although a majority of the state schools are in subdivision III-A, it is because of size, and not the source of funding. The larger private schools are also in Division III-A, while most of the smaller state schools are in III-AA. Subdivision allows for conferences to remain intact and all members of the same conference to compete in the same division. Subdivision lessens some tensions in legislative sessions that now spring from the wide diversity and philosophy of programs in singular national championships.

Subdivision will still maintain a common commitment to the tenets of Division III. Concern has been voiced that one subdivision might wish to propose legislation that differs from the other. This is not likely to happen since each sport will continue to have only one sports committee. Subdivision may increase staffing and other administrative needs relating to sports committees. Nevertheless, if it provides for more fair and equitable competition for our student-athletes, then it is worth the price. With our new budget, the moneys will certainly be available.

Subdivision supports student-athletes in their efforts to reach high, attainable levels of athletics performance, including opportunities for participation in national championships in which they have a reasonable chance to win. Subdivision allows for a more level playing field in the eight sports under consideration for subdivision. It is very unusual when one of the schools in the proposed Division III-AA wins one of these eight national championships. In 1995-96, schools in proposed Division III-A had an average of 1 in 7 chances to be selected for the national championships while only 1 in 17 Division III-AA teams were selected. Although only 40 percent of the teams are designated for Division III-A, 62 percent of the top-four finishers in the eight sports were from that division. In 1995-96, only one Division III-AA team won one of these eight championships.

There are two distinct groups of schools in Division III in terms of size, sports sponsorship and level of competition. The schools in one division obviously have an advantage over the other group of schools in terms of opportunities to compete and opportunities to win. The present model, with or without enhancements, is not equitable or fair. While it should be understood that no plan that subdivides or subgroups the Division III championships will be 100 percent ideal, this model uses the two most important factors agreed upon by a majority of the membership at last year's Convention — enrollment size and sports sponsorship. It is also supported by the records of recent past championships. For comparable competition and equal opportunity to compete, two championships seem to be the best choice. Thank you.

Mr. Appleton: Thank you, Jeff, Dennis and Kitty for your group presentation and your defense of this particular option. Our third presentation will describe the subgrouping model. We'll begin it with Mary Jo Gunning, Linda Hopple and Dick Rasmussen.

Richard A. Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Thank you. Linda, Mary Jo and I have decided to use a series of overheads to illustrate our presentation and to stay with a single presenter because of the tight time schedule. We hope that you find the presentation helpful.

The subgrouping model is simply an alternative way of feeding teams into a playoff structure that continues to determine a single national champion in each of the team sports currently under consideration. Football is a notable exception to this principle. I'll address that later in the presentation.

In the current championships structure, teams feed into the playoff brackets by geographical region. This promotes natural regional rivalries and helps minimize travel in the early rounds of play. In the subgrouping model, teams will feed in according to the subgroups to which they're assigned. Within each subgroup, teams would feed in by geographical region, however, and each of these regions would likely comprise about two of the current regions.

It's important that any championship structure have a sound philosophical basis. As with the rest of our athletics programs, the championships structure should address the needs and interests of our student-athletes. The postseason should be a positive part of the educational experience. That doesn't necessarily mean winning all the time. It does include providing opportunities for student-athletes to compete against other students whose college experience is one with which they can identify and feel a sense of commonality. Negative impact on the academic lives and the academic responsibilities of our student-athletes should be kept to a minimum. Keeping a focus on regular-season and conference play and achieving success at that level should lead to championship competition.

Before getting too far into the details of the model, I think some attention should be paid to the capacity of the subgrouping model. Assuming that each team in a championship would play two contests per week and that the championships should be completed within a three-week period, the maximum field size in a given sport is 64 teams.

If it's agreed that the ratios of 1 to 8 to 1 to 12 provide reasonable access to the championship structure, and if those ratios are applied to the maximum field size, it means that subgrouping or any of the other models can provide access for a maximum of 512 to 768 teams in a given sport. We currently have just under 400 with provisional members. Football, of course, is an exception to this because football teams can only play one contest per week. We'll come back to that later.

The subgrouping model attempts to build on a philosophy of regular-season play. That philosophy is in order to seize competition with institutions of similar "program definition." Program definition is wrapped around a number of different considerations, including the academic, demographic, geographical and institutional profiles of institutions. The net result is that this approach helps keep regular-season competition positive and meaningful for our student-athletes. This principle explains why we seek to form conferences and why we tend to focus on play within our conferences. Subgrouping to some degree could be considered an extension of this regular-season concept of championships. Subgrouping teams feed into the championships with four brackets. Grouping institutions with more similar program definitions into each of the four brackets makes the early rounds of championship play something of an extension of the regular season and a concept of conference play. As play progresses through the later rounds of the championships, the stronger teams emerge within each group and there tends to be a better competitive balance among teams of institutions with more heterogeneous program definitions.

In the end, however, student-athletes still have the opportunity to measure their abilities against the best of their peers. To a large degree, the key to making this work is to develop reasonable subgroupings of institutions. The subgroups that are suggested in this model were developed in response to comments, concerns and suggestions expressed by our membership during last year's Convention and in response to the questionnaires used at those meetings and in the spring. They're also the result of examining the institutional profiles of our membership to determine means by which those suggestions and the philosophical framework that I've noted can be translated into a workable model.

The goal was to develop four subgroups, knowing that the championship brackets must be organized into multiples of four. Three natural subgroups seemed to emerge as we looked at this information. The first of those subgroups were state institutions. The second subgroup was private institutions with relatively lower sports sponsorship levels—institutions sponsoring less than eight men's and less than eight women's sports. A third subgroup was private institutions with higher levels of sports sponsorship, those that sponsor at least eight men's and at least eight women's sports. To create the fourth group, we took that third group and split it in half since it was by far the largest group of the three. We split that in half on the basis of enrollment, using the mid-point in the distribution of enrollments to do that. The result, as you've seen in the background materials, is four groups that we've referred to as IV-A, III-A, II-A and I-A. I would suggest that overall the subgroups provide groupings of institutions that are not unreasonable.

It's not hard to see similarities across institutions and across conferences within each subgroup. There are exceptions. There will always be exceptions, but

overall these subgroups are consistent with the philosophic principles used as a framework for their development. It is reasonable to expect that further development of this model will include mechanisms to adjust these subgroupings, where appropriate, to be consistent with the basic principles of this approach.

The structure of how the championship is conducted in the subgrouping model is relatively straightforward. The championships will be conducted over a three-week period. The first weekend of competition consists of regional play within each subgroup. In most sports, these regionals would include two to four teams each. During the second weekend, a champion would be determined within each subgroup. The four subgroup champions would then meet over a third weekend to determine the Division III national champion. Some sports, for example baseball and softball, would use a slightly different approach. There's flexibility in that, just as there is in the current championship structure.

As noted earlier, football provides a notable exception. Actually, it's a dilemma. The football dilemma comes from two constraints. First, each team can only play one game each week. Second, our goal is to complete a championship within four weeks or, as noted, within a three-week period with the other sports. This leaves us with two pretty straightforward choices. We can either retain the current field size and a single national champion or we can choose to expand. But in doing so, we would have to give up the notion of a single national champion, which in the subgrouping model could lead to a bowl concept with the possibility of a champion within each subgrouping, but no overall champion. Another very real option within the subgrouping model would simply be to exclude football from the subgrouping model and keep the football championship as it currently exists.

As to conferences and automatic bids, within the subgrouping model, conferences can remain intact across subgroups. Automatic bids can still continue to be used. There are some issues in this area that will remain outstanding and that will have to be addressed, particularly whether it's appropriate for every qualified conference to receive an automatic bid in a given sport and, concurrently, perhaps whether the requirement for conference qualification should be raised from six institutions competing in the sport to eight institutions and making it consistent with the ratios we're trying to apply across the entire division.

Briefly, following are some of the advantages and positive aspects of subgrouping. Subgrouping retains the access ratios implemented under the current enhancement of sports championships. Subgrouping can accommodate growth while retaining this current level of access and for quite some time. The championships can be completed within a three-week period with the one exception of football, as we've noted. Subgrouping promotes a positive postseason experience for the student-athlete. It makes the postseason an extension of some of the most positive aspects of regular-season play and it retains a single national championship, which brings us full circle to the philosophical basis on which the model began.

The championships structure should address the needs and interests of our student-athletes. Postseason should be a positive part of the educational experience. Negative impact on the academic lives and responsibilities of student-athletes should be kept to a minimum. Keeping the focus on regular-season and conference play and achieving success at that level should lead to championship competition. Thank you.

Mr. Appleton: Thank you for that third presentation. The same fair play and professionalism that I've experienced in this task-force work for almost two years I feel is exemplified here this morning. We had forthright, fair, clear pre-

sentation on these three topics, with strong support being voiced by these three separate groups in favor of consideration of these matters. I think this paves the way in an extraordinary fashion by just taking 45 minutes to explain the three models for the conversations we will have in small group discussions this afternoon and then as we get back together this afternoon.

Thanks to all of you. Bridget, maybe you'd like to make a comment before we conclude this morning. I hope you will move smartly after lunch to the discussions and then quickly back here for some further conversation this afternoon.

Ms. Belgiovine: If you have questions, please put them on those white sheets and bring them to the voting table. If you'd drop those questions down, the task force will review them over lunch. We will reconvene at your group sessions.

[The Division III business session was recessed for lunch.]

Monday Afternoon, January 13, 1997

DISCUSSION SESSION

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): Ladies and gentlemen, if you would be seated so we can begin this afternoon's program. I welcome everyone back from lunch that I hope was calorie and cholesterol free. I hope you're all settled in for this afternoon's session.

The purpose of these breakout sessions is to conduct more dialogue on the championships models, answer any of your questions or concerns and to clarify various points relative to the three models that were presented this morning.

Our panel this afternoon will start with Dennis Collins, the executive director of the North Coast Athletic Conference. Dennis will represent the subdivision model. Dick Rasmussen, executive secretary of the University Athletic Association, will represent the subgrouping. Judy Sweet, athletics director at Cal San Diego will speak to the enhancement model. Dan Bridges, the athletics director of Cal Tech and the cochair of the restructuring committee, will be here to lend us guidance, as will Marybeth Ruskamp, who's assistant chief of staff of Division III.

Those individuals who would like to ask questions should come to the microphone, identify themselves and then ask your question. Try to direct it specifically to the individual who represents the model that your question will relate to. To get started this afternoon, we have identified a number of questions in each of the submodel groupings that we feel should be addressed because they continue to show up on a number of questionnaire surveys. To start with, I would ask Judy Sweet if she would bring forth one of the questions that we heard during our evaluation of the questionnaires Judy.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): There were really three questions that received the most attention for the enhancement model. I'll start with the first one pertaining to football.

"What does the enhancement model do for football, given that we're proposing a 1-to-8 to 1-to-12 ratio?" We all recognize the unique aspects of football that do not allow for competing in more than one competition per week. The enhancement model is not a finalized model. Right now, it has addressed team sports that had high sponsorship numbers. The intent is to go back and review football as well as the individual sports to determine if it would be appropriate to make some adjustments. The models under subdivision and subgrouping for football could apply even with the enhancement model. There could be something different that's done in order to provide more access for football-playing institutions.

Mr. Schiner: Thank you, Judy. Dennis, questions that you would like to put forth for the subdivision?

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): Thank you. We had some good questions. One of them was when we drafted the subdivision model, why were just two criteria—basically enrollment and sports sponsorship—selected?

There's a simple answer to that. That's what you told us you wanted. Last January, we had a very complete survey that you did a great job of filling out for us. Of the number of criteria, if you recall, we had state versus private and so forth and so on. The two top vote-getters by far were size of enrollment and sports sponsorship. So those were the two that were selected for the subdivision model, because that's what you wanted as a body.

I think as you look at the subdivision model you will see that enrollment is not everything. It's certainly not everything. In fact, it only kicks in for about half of the group. But as a division, we place a high value on broad-based programs, high sports sponsorship and opportunities for our kids. I think that in recognition that that does vary amongst the division members—and some are doing the best they can—it was an attempt to try to match people up on those two criteria. For example, let's take a case where you have a private school, so that would be the same. Both have enrollments of 2,000. But one school would have a sports sponsorship of eight sports, while the other school would sponsor 22 sports. The commitment is quite different between the two institutions. It was felt that that was a significant difference as far as the budget philosophy, competitive equity, the amounts of salaries and so forth.

Those were your primary concerns. Those were the two criteria that you developed. I think it keeps it pretty simple. It keeps it to athletics criteria, by and large. There is a correlation where high enrollment tends to be a little more successful in national championships. That's shown, but I think that if you try to keep it close to athletics type of criteria, those seem to be fairly neutral and straightforward. They are based — at least the sports sponsorship—on our Division III philosophy.

That was a good question. That is the answer to it.

Mr. Schiner: Thank you, Dennis. Dick Rasmussen now will make comments regarding questions that were identified for the subgrouping model.

Richard A. Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Thanks, Larry.

There were four questions that appeared with some regularity on the questionnaires. I'll try to answer each of them.

The first and probably one of the more obvious questions is: "Why are public institutions singled out or separated out into their own subgroup?" No matter how you create subgroups, there is an arbitrary nature to how any type of subgrouping gets accomplished. There's great diversity within our institutions, even within these subgroups. So those lines and the implications that they carry with them aren't always black and white. There's a lot of overlap between types of institutions and comparable institutions across subgroups. The model is based, however, on the responses that were received last year from the Convention survey. There were quite a few individuals who identified issues related to public versus private institutions.

There are some characteristics that give public institutions a unique character, such as their funding mechanisms for their programs or for facility construction. Their tuition structure is different from that of private institutions. Currently, their financial aid structures are different. The pool of prospective students from which they recruit oftentimes, although not always, is different

because of the missions that they have as public institutions and serving the constituencies within the local area or the state in which they reside. But it was a grouping that was readily identified by quite a few individuals throughout the Association. I think one of the things to keep in mind is that it's not as if they're off unto themselves and not a part of the division. One of the key things to keep in mind is that all four subgroups feed back into one championship. We don't lose contact with each other during the regular season. I would expect that there would be as much crossover within the regular season between subgroups as there is today.

The second question had to do with the relative size of the four subgroups, specifically why the IV-A subgroup is so much larger—153 institutions. That really has to do with the definition of that subgroup. That subgroup is defined as institutions with relatively low sports sponsorship levels. As a result, if we're looking across the eight different sports, we're going to have to have more institutions in that subgroup in order to come up with sport-by-sport fields that are roughly comparable to the other divisions. When you play the numbers out among those 153 institutions sport by sport, we end up with about 80 to 100 institutions sponsoring each sport, which is comparable to the other three subgroups. So all four subgroups, when you go sport by sport, are fairly close—plus or minus 15 or 20 institutions. The 1-to-8 to 1-to-12 ratios are applied the same across subgroups. So if a subgroup has more teams competing in the championship in a given sport, they'll have more teams in the playoff structure. The size of their bracket will be a little bit larger. If they have fewer teams, they'll have fewer teams because the ratio of 1 to 8 or whatever it turns out to be for that sport is applied across all four subgroups.

The third question had to do with concerns about geography and how it plays into travel—particularly in the early rounds—and how it plays into the selection process. As I noted during the presentation, the teams within each subgroup would feed into the championship geographically. They'll feed in geographically within their subgroup. We would probably go through a process of redesigning regions. In all likelihood, new regions under that type of a model would probably be equivalent to combining two of the existing regions. In other words, the geographical regions would probably be about twice as large.

In some cases those implications—for example, in the Northeast—of combining the East and Northeast regions geographically aren't that great. As we cross the Mississippi, that changes a little bit, but the scale isn't that much different than it is right now. When you get out in the western part of the country, oftentimes you have teams that are traveling pretty sizable distances in the early rounds. I don't know that the travel implications are appreciably different than what they are right now. Once you get past the first round, the travel situation's very similar to what it is now.

As to how geography plays into the selection process, we've had selection committees that are made up of members who have regional responsibilities for tracking teams within their regions. You would just substitute the term "subgroup" for region. Where you may have a national selection committee of eight individuals tracking eight regions, you might now have a selection committee of eight individuals tracking four subgroups. You'd have two people assigned to track this subgroup and two assigned to track this subgroup and so on. They would be supported by their own subcommittees, just like we do now with regional selection committees.

The fourth question that was asked frequently came up across both models and has to do with the appeal of assignment. If I'm assigned to one subgroup,

what are my options if I feel that the way that subgroup's defined is a definition that my institution or my conference doesn't fit into?

I guess the response to that at this point is that that whole area is an open question. Certainly, there could be a process, I would anticipate, where conferences could make their case for one subgroup or another based on the rationale about how they fit in with the definition of one subgroup or another. The notion of independent institutions probably follows the same rationale. That's an open question that will have to be dealt with. I don't think any of us on the task force are prepared to provide a final answer at this point because the concept of an institution leaving its conference for championship play has some real serious implications that come back to the philosophic framework where we're looking to make postseason play something of an extension of conference play. So it's an open question, but it's one we have to think very hard on before we get any more definitive about it.

Mr. Schiner: Thank you, Dick. Judy has two additional questions that she would like to put forth to the membership that did come off our survey.

Ms. Sweet: The other two questions, although they were listed under the enhancement package, I think really pertain to the other models in some way.

The first question was: "How will automatic qualification be affected?" I want to clarify that automatics are determined by sport committees. It's my belief that as the brackets expand, that there will be increased potential for more conference automatic berths, but the final decision is made by the Championships Committee after recommendations from the various sports committees. That may vary from sport to sport, depending on what the circumstances might be.

The second question had to do with the principle of trying to keep some time restrictions on the championships or trying to complete a championship within a three-week time period. How many schools can be accommodated and still stay within that three-week time period? Looking at a potential 64-team bracket in a particular sport being able to be played out in three weeks if the 1 to 8 ratio is applied, potentially 512 institutions could be accommodated; and the 1 to 12 is 768.

Mr. Collins: We did have another pretty common question about the subdivision model. There basically was a concern about if we go to the subdivision model, will that preclude or discourage schools from scheduling each other that are traditional rivals. We do not want to preclude that kind of thing. I think one good thing about the good work of the governance of our new Division III is that we have taken steps to really invigorate and put some more controls and attention on sport committees as far as making sure that the will of the membership reflected through the leadership will be adhered to as far as what the policy is. We decide that we do not want subdivision to preclude scheduling each other. If I'm School A in Cleveland, Ohio, and 10 miles down the road there's School B and we're in two different subdivisions, but I always play School B, I still want to continue to do that. We want to encourage that. We don't want to make this a burden on costs or destroy traditional rivals.

Subdivision is merely about more access for student-athletes, trying to have meaningful access that won't take all of our time as far as some simple mathematics. In subdivision, the access stays the same, but the contests are reduced. That's one of the big benefits to our institutions under this model. On occasion, we have compared subdivision to I-A and I-AA football. I want to explain that a little bit. Only in concept is that what we're talking about here.

Division I-A and I-AA have very different rules. Division I-A has 85 football scholarships, for example; I-AA, I don't even know the number, maybe 60 schol-

arships. They may have some other different rules. There's no intention of having I-A or I-AA or whatever we wind up calling it, with different rules. We want to keep the sport committees the same. We're going to expand those sport committees to accommodate the expanded championships and the I-A and the I-AA's, but we want to have the same playing rules, the same policies, the same legislation.

We're still Division III. We want to continue to be Division III. This is merely an accommodation of our growing size. There is no other division or any collegiate entity in the history of the United States that is as big as Division III, and we're growing.

We want to provide reasonable access, and that's what subdivision is all about. It's very simple. It's access for our student-athletes, but it's reasonable access in a good time frame in an academic division.

So yes, it's like I-A and I-AA in concept only. So, you understand what we're trying to do—concurrent national championships within one division. But please, please understand that this is not an attempt to split up Division III. Actually, it's an attempt to provide more access as we grow as a division. I think that's really the best. So if there's anybody out there who thinks we're not going to have the same rules as we always had, we're going to continue to be unified as Division III. Our kids are going to have more opportunity. That's the bottom line on that.

That's an important question. I'm glad a number of people did ask that question. I hope you will ask some more questions at this point from the floor.

Mr. Schiner: We certainly encourage your questions and solicit your input on any of the three championships models. This is really what the discussion breakout sessions are all about, to get your input.

Porter G. Miller (Earlham College): I need a point of clarification. We talk about the enhancements and the championship models, but we've been referring to the enhancements as a model. My understanding was that the enhancements are already going to be in place and that that amount of money will be used on whatever model we're going to talk about or ultimately vote on. If I am wrong about that, I need to be corrected. If I'm right, I think the membership needs to understand that, because there is a difference. I wouldn't recommend voting on enhancements, something that we already had.

Mr. Schiner: I think we just used the term "model" for simplicity purposes. But you are correct, the enhancement will be in effect in 1997-98. We're really just concerned right now with trying to determine whether it would be subgrouping or subdivisions. That's where that extra money would be solicited to support either one of those two championships.

George C. Heider (Concordia University, Illinois): I'd like to observe in reference to the subdivision model that a very powerful argument in its favor is to be found in Addendum D, which shows that institutions that would be gathered under this model in the AA category have, for whatever reason, been all but shut out from championships by virtue of their performance.

The question I have, however, is with reference to the criteria used to split between A and AA. Why group those with more population with those with less sports? If I read you correctly, the ones in A would be those with greater population, but with less sports.

Mr. Collins: It's a two-part answer. Those in A tend to have larger enrollment and those institutions above 500 in enrollment that have a sports sponsorship below six. So we're dealing with two variables.

Let me give you an example. You will find maybe a school of 600, for example, that is in the A subdivision with the larger enrollment schools. Most of the

schools of that size would probably have a much higher sports sponsorship than the majority of Division III and they would be in AA.

Here again, it's a value we have in Division III. We value higher sports sponsorship, a broad-based program. Those that do not value it quite as much would be assigned to A because they would be less common with the group in AA, if that makes any sense. Here again, it's just two criteria. You'll find yourself in either subdivision because of one or the other.

Julie Fernandez (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): In reference to the subgroup model, I understand that the decision is in part because of the growing number of institutions that are joining Division III. Is there a fear that as the criteria has been set forth in adding those schools that it may become lopsided in some fields or some sports as you add those institutions? You say now it's relatively equal between the number of institutions involved. Is that a fear?

Mr. Rasmussen: With regard to the notion that putting the subgrouping model forward as a reaction to fear about the influx of institutions from the NAIA, it's not based on that fear or on that perception. Personally, I don't feel that that's an issue. I think most of the migration that's occurred from the NAIA to Division III has probably already happened. If you look at the profile of institutions that remain with the NAIA, you'll find that their profiles are very different in large measure from Division III and that their needs wouldn't be met by the NCAA unless we established an entirely separate division for that type of institution. They tend to be very small institutions with very low sports sponsorship levels. So that's not the issue.

The subgrouping model is a response to concerns that portions of the membership put forward about disparities within postseason competition and trying to get away from situations where in the early rounds of postseason competition there isn't as much competitive equity as maybe there could be. It's an effort to address some of those concerns. As to how valid those concerns are, that's up to everyone to make that judgment individually, but it's really a reaction to that portion of the membership that has that sort of concern.

As for the notion of growth, there is room within the subgrouping, as there is if we go with the current championship structure and the subdivision. There's room for growth. As Judy mentioned, we're 400 institutions. We can go to 512 before we get into a situation where we're changing our ratios significantly.

Dick Kaiser (Olivet College): I had a statement and also a question about subgrouping.

If you had the opportunity to go through the statistics, it's very interesting that in our current Division III membership with approximately 400 members, 30-plus percent of those members have never had a men's or women's team participate in postseason competition in these eight men's sports and women's sports. I think that is pretty alarming with our current guidelines. I think you should look at this and applaud these individuals for trying to increase the opportunities, not only through enhancement, but also through the subgrouping and this subdivision. I found that very alarming.

My question to the subgrouping is what rationale—I'm sure it was extremely difficult to decide who goes where and what goes with what—would you have for splitting the northwest schools in the NCIC and the California schools in two different subgroups? You have just created a monumental and expensive task of transporting teams across the United States when they could be in the same subgroup.

Mr. Rasmussen: Let me try to address both aspects of that. One is the notion of opportunity to participate in the championships. The second part of that, what

you're talking about, is splitting the schools in the west and the northwest. The notion that 30 percent of our membership may not have participated in the championship structure probably isn't going to change no matter which of the three directions we take.

One of the things I did for our conference this fall, in fact in the last few weeks, was to take a look at the history of our championships and tally institution by institution and conference by conference how many times each institution and how many times each conference had had teams in the championship, the win-loss records and how many times they finished first, second, third or fourth. When you look at that information across conferences, you see that across conferences there's pretty good representation sport by sport. A lot of it's very time driven. It's very coach dependent. An institution has a coach and that team in that sport is in the championship consistently for five or six years. The coach takes a position someplace else and they disappear from the face of the earth in that sport. That's not unusual. Championship success in Division III is very much a mixture. If anyone's looking in either of these options to get away from a situation where they perceive that they're dominated by a group of institutions or conferences, that's not going to happen. Most of us are going to trade one master for another.

As for the second part of the question—the splitting up of the institutions in the west and increased travel—the intent of the model isn't to split up schools in that area. It just so happens that those institutions fall into two different subgroups. One of the difficulties is that in the northwest and in the western region, we start from a very small number of institutions. Right now, institutions in that area, even in the initial rounds of the championships, more often than not have to travel very significant distances. That's not going to change drastically with subgrouping.

So it's not intended to split those up. It's not something done necessarily by choice. I think it's a reflection of the low number of Division III institutions in that part of the country.

Ms. Sweet: I'd like to add something to the question about access since that question comes up frequently. All three of the models increase access to championships. As Dick has indicated, it doesn't necessarily mean that the eventual champion is going to be very different. But one of the things that we heard very clearly was that you felt there needed to be increased access.

Previously, in the old structure, the process for increasing brackets wasn't based on the objective criteria of a ratio. There was a subjective criteria of quality of competition. Somehow, somebody felt that they could evaluate what the quality of competition was in a given sport and then determine what the right size of a bracket for each sport should be. The recommendations had to be approved by the Executive Committee since the funding for increased brackets came from the Executive Committee. By no coincidence, the Executive Committee was primarily composed of Division I representatives.

One of the positive aspects of the new structure is that we do have more authority over our own destiny. That doesn't mean that we are going to be less accountable, but we do have some flexibility that we didn't have before. That flexibility allowed for increasing the brackets in accord with the 1-to-8 or 1-to-12 ratio. So from the championships aspect, next year with the new enhanced brackets, there will be increased access—no different than what's being proposed—because the same ratio is being proposed for the subdivision and the subgrouping.

Mr. Collins: Dick, I did want to point out that under the subdivision model, the Northwest Conference of Independent Colleges and the Southern California

Intercollegiate Athletic Conference would be in the same AA subdivision. I think one of the beauties of the subdivision model is that by dividing in half, you still have substantial fields where championship travel is still not very difficult. It's similar to what we have right now.

Dick has indicated that under the subgroup model it is a little more difficult. It's probably the equivalent of two of our districts right now. I think that is one of the benefits of the subdivision model. It's a system that accommodates good travel in the championship rounds.

Steve Wallo (Lewis and Clark College): To address the question that Dick Kaiser brought up, in the subgrouping model, I want a clarification.

I believe when new data is measured in with the Northwest Conference, we would not be in a different subgrouping than the California Conference. I think some of the numbers are old information. Some of our institutions have added sports. I think in a subgrouping model we would then fall in with the SCI AC.

Mr. Rasmussen: That brings up an interesting point. I think there's one caveat as you're looking at both of these models that you need to be real careful about. Understand that both of these models are works in progress. Don't put too much reliance on precisely where you fall within the models. Pay attention to the philosophy that both of these models express and what they do conceptually—the framework within which they exist—because if either of these goes forward, institutions and conferences very well at this time next year could be looking at themselves on the other side of the fence or on a different side of the clock. So when you're looking at it, spend your time looking at the philosophical and conceptual framework about it and bear in mind that it's a work in progress. Where you lie within the framework right now can change. Be sure that you would be as happy on the other side of the fence or in a different grouping, because some of those things may change as these things evolve.

Judith W. Burling (Regis College, Massachusetts): I think a number of us have talked about the fact that we do want access, we do want balance, but we're not happy at all with the two new models.

We feel the expanded brackets seem to answer what we're looking for. I think if we have sports committees that are doing their jobs with the expanded bracket, we'll be happy. But to start tinkering around with moving us into groups in a somewhat arbitrary fashion, I think it's going to be very difficult. A lot of us would be happy to see the expanded bracket be well developed. Let us get involved in sports committees and we'll be happy. (Applause)

Helmut Werner (Randolph-Macon College): I have a little bit of a problem with the subdivision model turning into two championships. It gives the perception that we might be moving to almost like a Division IV. We have two different championships and the public in particular might perceive it as being two different divisions with one being less competitive than the other.

I like the subgrouping model better, but I still have a problem for the same reason with the A, AA, AAA and so on. Were other names considered for those groups?

Mr. Collins: Yes, sir. Right now we're calling it Subdivision A and AA. If anyone out there has a better idea, we want to hear it. This is still a model, as Dick said. I would agree with Dick. It's a work in progress. We're looking for names, so we would like to have some ideas in regard to that. I'm sorry, I forgot the first part of your question. If you could help me out one more time.

Mr. Werner: The perception of two championships.

Mr. Collins: I think that that's an initial fear. We've heard that from some of our coaches. Like all of our good coaches, we want to listen to them. They're

out there on the front lines recruiting. This is not a Division IV. We can work on the name. Like everything else, the student-athletes are the prime consideration here. I know in the Ohio high schools we just added another subdivision, if you will, in football—Division VI. Those kids are just as happy to play in the Division VI state championship as the kids in the higher division. I think you get over it after a year or so and I think you become happy with it.

I know that the people in NCAA I-AA football are mighty proud of their I-AA championship across those 120 good schools. It's an honor to be involved in that championship. I think that's a momentary thing. Once the benefits of being in championship play with institutions more like yourself are experienced, you'll be thrilled and your coaches will be very happy about it. Thank you.

David M. Hutter (Case Western Reserve University): In deference to my colleagues at the table, Dick and Dennis, we are unique in many, many ways in NCAA Division III and certainly in a precarious position with respect to this proposal. I would suggest that neither the subdivision nor the subgrouping model is appropriate at this particular point for a couple of reasons. One was mentioned this morning. Both of those models preclude self-determination, one of the primary principles upon which Division III was put together.

Secondly, it precludes criteria that are perhaps more critical to the development of a successful athletics program than are enrollment and/or numbers of sports; those criteria being philosophy of program in reference to self-determination, financial aid and policy and procedure.

Three, the academic policies of a particular institution. I note that one of the priorities of the next group of leaders is the financial aid policy. That might give us some time to think about that criteria to stay with Model 1, the enhancement program. There are two other reasons, much different than the access and the championship issues that have been espoused. The grouping and/or the subdividing proposals suggest a diminishing of power of Division III in the broader sense as it's related to the integrity, purposefulness and the stature of Division III intercollegiate athletics relative to intercollegiate athletics generally and specifically relative to some of the publicity that we've received with regard to Division I intercollegiate athletics. Equally as important is that I think the models provide an opportunity for some power struggling, some in-fighting and for a lack of focus on Division III principles and issues that will divide the group more dramatically in terms of philosophy as opposed to some pragmatic championship play.

I would urge the group to consider staying with the enhancement proposal that was presented to us. Thank you.

Richard J. Hazelton (Trinity College, Connecticut): My question has to do with the NAIA. I've heard quite a bit of information that it's going to fold soon or it's not going to fold soon. The questions are back and forth. We've just passed Proposal 55, so after August 1 you have to wait four years rather than three years to go through a probationary period. Whether some schools are going to jump into that before August 1, I have no idea. I think it would be prudent to come up with a plan to meet the possibility of schools coming in. We could have possibly a "hot button" if 425 schools are in Division III, we would go to a certain plan.

I've heard support for keeping the status quo along with the increase in brackets. But in this time of change that the NCAA is going through, especially in Division I, Division I-AA and Division III, it might be prudent to look at one of the plans very seriously when we reach a certain break in membership.

Mr. Collins: I know Dick had a chance to talk a little bit about the NAIA. There is a lot of speculation about it.

I think two years ago we felt we were doing a good thing when we were really feeling some heat with the NAIA. I think in good faith we passed a moratorium on membership, which at the time seemed like a good idea. I want to give recognition to President Ed Coll. When we decided to do that, it was a good idea. We took action. However, I think one of the bad consequences of that, as it turned out now, has been that it has lulled our membership into thinking that there is no problem.

The moratorium's intent was to give us an opportunity to do some planning. I think in many cases the reverse has happened. It's given our membership a false sense of security. Maybe we are not interested in change or don't want to see some of our problems that we have. The growth issues gave us an opportunity to be lulled to sleep. We really in many ways have not taken advantage of Ed's good work during that moratorium period. I believe the moratorium comes off no earlier than January 1998.

Marybeth Ruskamp (NCAA Staff): There actually wasn't a date. It was to be lifted once the restructuring process was in effect.

At the recent Council meeting, it received a recommendation from the NCAA Transition Oversight Committee asking that the moratorium be lifted no earlier than the 1998 Convention, which would give each of the divisions an opportunity to go through one full legislative process before it was lifted. So the moratorium will be lifted and we'll begin to accept applications for new membership after the 1998 Convention.

Mr. Collins: Basically, we will have an opportunity to see what is happening out there with the NAIA. I do want to comment on the idea of a trigger point that Rick mentioned.

I think it's an outstanding idea. It's one that's been mentioned before. I think it's one that ought to be seriously considered again by the Division III Management Council and the Presidents Council, especially if we are going to start receiving new applications. I think it would be prudent. It would be good planning on behalf of this large national organization to do that. I think that's an excellent idea. Thank you.

Mr. Rasmussen: Trying to predict the future is pretty risky. I mentioned before that I feel we're on pretty stable ground. The issue of NAIA institutions isn't the issue that in some cases was implied once upon a time.

I disagree that we haven't done anything in that regard. We not only have a plan, but we have this morning implemented some things and addressed some of the concerns that came out of those discussions about the potential for new members. We adopted legislation this morning that increases our sports sponsorship requirements and our team sports sponsorship requirements. We adopted legislation that extends the provisional membership period from three years to four years.

Those things help to ensure that as institutions apply for membership to Division III, that they go through a substantial educational process that puts them in touch with our Division III philosophy, that helps them to understand its meaning and its application. If we have institutions applying for membership that understand our philosophy, that live by our philosophy, I'm not sure that we should necessarily be involved in keeping them out of our number.

Those are the kinds of institutions we want. It means our philosophy stands for something. It stands for wanting to be associated with other institutions that respect and espouse the same type of philosophy we have. We've taken some very real measures to ensure that that happens. The new Membership Committee within our new governance structure will have before it the task of providing

educational seminars and other efforts to help our current members better understand our philosophy, to better put our philosophy into practice in a more consistent fashion.

Those are significant steps that we've taken. They have addressed a lot of the issues that have driven much of this conversation for the last few years. I don't think we should discount the effect of those things.

Edwin Abar (Westfield State College): I'd like to respond to the subgrouping that puts the state-funded schools in their own unit. I believe that is illogical reasoning. You're assuming that the variables that exist in the other groups, such as sponsorship, enrollment and level of financial aid are all the same. You also state that colleges coming into this division would have the opportunity to choose their subgroup. The state colleges would not have a chance to choose because they would already have been placed in a subgroup.

We have state colleges with 8,000 students. We have state colleges with 1,400. We are in a state where our legislature does not particularly like our public schools. When I went to the state school, it was 80 percent funded. It is now 30 percent funded. That may vary from state to state. I think you're grouping the state schools into one body under certain assumptions that are not true. I teach at a state college. My students who come to that state college are mostly low- and middle-income kids who have an inferiority complex because they can't afford the wealthy private schools. This will exacerbate that situation. I think that's wrong. Thank you.

Robert G. Bierie (Loras College): In both the enhancement and the subgrouping plan the football issue hasn't been satisfactorily addressed.

I hear you say it's still in the conceptual stages. But from my experience at past Conventions, you raise the issue of football and it's almost like the bogeyman. It's very difficult, especially in light of what the Presidents Commission has to say about expanding the bracket for football and expanding the length of the season. So when you talk about expansion with enhancement, what are you going to do about football?

Secondly, in subgrouping, you're talking about a bowl picture. Again, if you go to a national champion, you're expanding the season, you're expanding the size of the brackets. With subdivision, the biggest problem—especially for some private schools that have an impressive recruiting posture—is a perception. Cut it any way you want. You're still going to have a pecking order. Especially schools such as ours. We border three states. We compete against the NAIA and state schools. Our biggest fear is the perception and where we're going to fall in that order.

Ms. Sweet: I'd like to try to answer the football question again. It's my understanding that the Division III football committee is currently working on preparing some proposals to send forward to the Division III Championships Committee. There is full recognition that the ratio right now does not apply appropriately to football. There is a sincere commitment to try to come up with a solution. My impression is that the solution will probably be something that results in either subdivisions or a bowl concept.

Because of the numbers, it would be very difficult to have the 1-to-8 or 1-to-12 ratio and keep it within—right now it's a four-week championship—the three-week time period unless we are creative in how we approach it. But there is a commitment to improve the access.

Annette Shapiro (Nazareth College): This is for Dick. What is the historical ratio of teams that go to the championships that have full-time coaches and what is the ratio of their budgets in comparison to the ones that don't go to the cham-

pionships?

Mr. Rasmussen: I crunched a lot of numbers the last two years, but I think I would choke on that project. I can't give you a definitive answer on that. I think it's reasonable to expect that the greater percentage of full-time coaches an institution has, the higher the level of funding per sport, the more likely teams are going to be successful. If you can recruit off campus in some instances or deal with different things programmatically, your chances of success are greater. I think one of the dangers of some of this is to assume that we can get something for nothing by changing the way in which we organize our championships.

If you want to be successful on the national level, regardless of whether it's subgrouping or the current championships structure or national level with subdivision, it's going to take some sort of institutional commitment and resources. It's just not going to happen on its own.

Timothy W. Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): Other than the football issue, which is a problem with the enhancement model and the subgrouping model, if you look at our Division III numbers 10 years ago and you look at them five years ago and you look at them now, it doesn't take a math major to figure out where these numbers are headed. It's not a fair question to ask Judy or Dick, but it's a question that I'm going to ask everyone in here. Do we really want to say to our student-athletes that in order to be a national champion, you've got to go out and beat 500 other schools? I mean, is that really fair to say to them? That's what we're headed for.

If you look at any other division in any other sport in any other level, in any other concept, in order to be a champion, it is not that difficult. Yet we in Division III are turning to almost lottery proportions of improbability with this. The only way that we can be fair to our student-athletes and give them somewhat of a probable shot is with subdivision. It's not with the other two models.

John A. Clark (St. Lawrence University): I came here, like my professional brothers and sisters, with probably much more confidence in the model that I would favor. But as I listen to the arguments for each one, it appears to me that I'm unsettled with the criteria that seems to be used in each case. It appears to me that there is more hope and more potential for creativity if we stay with the enhancement model and focus our attention on being creative in selecting the correct opponents and placing them against the appropriate opponent in the early rounds. (Applause)

Robert D. Bunnell (Kenyon College): Unfortunately, the NCAA has historically waited until the proverbial horse is out of the barn before we begin to act on issues.

It took us a long time to tighten academic standards after we were made aware of all the problems. We have dealt with sportsmanship issues after fights and terrible incidents at athletics contests. We have taken on the welfare of student-athletes far beyond the time when they were first being taken advantage of. Now, we're talking about looking at financial aid when we already have all kinds of financial aid problems in existence.

Could we possibly for once look ahead and project a problem and try to solve it and make a plan for it before it's too late? We're in a situation where I think these assumptions are fair to make. One, Division III is growing. Two, it's going to continue to grow. Three, as Tim Gleason just said, the numbers are getting out of control. There will be no access to championships. I think the status quo is probably comfortable, but inappropriate at this point. If you really look at the two models of subdivision and subgrouping, if you add a championship between the two subdivisions, you have the exact same model as the subgroup. It's just

divided into four parts rather than two.

I think subdivision is coming whether we like it or not. We need to make a plan for it. I would encourage everyone to take a good, hard look at the subdivision model. (Applause)

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): To my colleague from Randolph-Macon, I happened to be around in 1973 when the college and university divisions split into three. There were many people that tore their hair out and said, "Oh, Division III, nobody will respect Division III championships. Our kids won't want to do it."

Well, Division III championships turned out to be pretty good. People who have won Division III championships feel very good about them. If there's subdivision and III-A and a III-B, and the competition and the coaching is good, and the students enjoy the competition, people will feel good about the championships in a III and III-B or red and white or blue and gold or whatever you want to call it. That's one point.

If I could ask somebody on the dais, has there been a legal interpretation given about whether the NCAA can refuse to accept membership once the moratorium is over?

Mr. Collins: A couple of years ago when I was on the Council, we did face this issue before the moratorium. I think there was consultation with the NCAA legal counsel and it was felt that we could not stop people from applying if they met our standards. I'm pretty confident that was the answer.

Mr. Marshall: If that is the case, then I think it's very prudent that we do the long-range planning, as was mentioned by the previous speaker. Even though some of the schools that might be coming in later might not buy into the Division III philosophy, if the NCAA is the only game in town, we can't keep them out. All of a sudden Division III is going to be 600, 650 or 700 schools. If that's the case, enhancement or the status quo isn't going to get it done.

Mr. Schiner: Thank you, Bill. There certainly will be opportunity for further discussion in the 3 p.m. session. I would like to thank everyone very much for your input and certainly encourage you to vote on both questions that will be part of the straw vote. Thank you very much.

Ms. Belgiovine: At this time, I'd like to bring President Jim Appleton back to the podium to continue with the discussion that began in the three breakouts.

Mr. Appleton: I express appreciation to all of you who have participated in this breakout discussion. Lively, good questions, important issues; I and other members of the task force and the Commission appreciate this very much. I hope that the sessions proved valuable to you as well.

We are now ready to open the floor for general comments and questions for one half hour. We intend at approximately 3:30 or shortly thereafter to conduct two straw votes. They are preferences only. They do not bind legislation, but they're important statements by the delegates who represent the institutions that are present at this Convention. This is one more opportunity for you to make comments or ask questions. I will try to moderate those questions. I would urge that we listen to those who come to the microphone. If it's a question I need to refer to a person on the task force who would be in the best position to respond to that particular question, I'll do so. But those members are in the audience so that they, too, can vote in this straw vote at the appropriate time because most of them are delegates from their institutions. I'd be happy to entertain a comment or begin at this time.

John M. Schael (Washington University, Missouri): We're going to have an opportunity to take a very important vote and to provide direction to the task

force committee and to the Presidents Council for our future direction.

There seems to be a lot of confusion at this particular point in time about how all of that is going to pan out. I'd like to make a friendly suggestion to the members of Division III and hopefully to the task force that they give consideration to this idea.

On my voting device, I've got a "yes" and I have a "no" and I have an "abstain." We would like to compare one model against the other. For example, if I would like to take the enhancement model, I could use the yes button on my voting device for that if I'm in favor of it. At the same time, I could use the no button if I'm in favor of subdivision. My third choice is to press the abstain button if I favor subgrouping.

With that procedure, we would be very clear in terms of the direction that we provide you as members of Division III. (Applause)

Mr. Appleton: Let me make a comment, then it would be appropriate for me to turn to the vice-president of our division to comment further.

It's been thoroughly discussed earlier in the task force. Our recommendations were submitted to the Presidents Commission, which serves in days ahead as the policy and legislative body for this organization. A decision has been made that we will stay with both of those votes in order and that we would not deviate from that plan at this time. I appreciate your comment. I know there is some concern about this tripartite piece, but there will be two votes. One will be a "yes" or a "no" with regard to the enhancement package. The second will be to give us better direction than we've had in the past. If we choose to move beyond enhancements, which of these two prototypes would best serve your interests, as stated today, but not as legislation.

Mr. Schael: I respect that opinion. However, if you take the three votes as just outlined, we can compare one with the other. If people like the enhanced model and the subgrouping as well, then you know what direction you're going. When you separate the two, it creates a lot of confusion on the part of a lot of members, including myself.

Ms. Belgiovine: What you do with Question No. 1, however, is get a greater strength of where the membership truly is on whether or not you want to go beyond enhancements. That's the full membership. In essence, you are not splitting the membership three ways. You're getting an answer to one basic question. Do you favor going beyond championships enhancement for a legislative purpose in January of 1998? That's a very succinct question that we'd like your answer on. We need the response from the whole membership. Either you choose to or you choose not to for this one year.

The second question is taken independently and asks your opinion regardless of where you voted on the first question—forget the first question. If the membership at some point goes beyond championships enhancement—you may not have favored it, but if we are to go beyond that point—which of those two would you then favor? We're asking it in that format to clarify for us what direction we should travel—subdivision or subgrouping. If you abstain, you give us no clear direction on which model we should continue to pursue.

Mr. Appleton: At some point, a member of the Presidents Commission may wish to speak to that. The Presidents Commission feels very strongly that we should have direction on both of those questions and, in fact, is quite committed to looking at the response to the second certainly as much as the first.

Ray K. Hammond (Centre College): I would like to address the perspective from which our institution has arrived at its decision in this process. We did, in fact, informally, not scientifically, ask our athletes what kind of championship

they thought would be most equitable. In our breakout session, it was stated that probably no one in there had, in fact, ever asked the athletes what they wanted. I suspect that many of us have.

The fact is that any greater formal recognition of the perspective from which institutions establish their athletics and academic philosophies will, indeed, make some institutions more comfortable in competing for championships. Let me give you just a simple example. The pool of prospective student-athletes from which institutions may recruit varies widely with the diversity of the institutions in Division III. Assume there are 10,000 prospective student-athletes for a particular sport. Institution A recruits from the entire pool, while Institution B recruits from a small portion of that pool. Clearly, "A" has a competitive advantage; "B" will be much more comfortable competing with those institutions for an extra championship in which the recruiting methods and parameters are pretty much the same.

That's the perspective from which Centre College and similar institutions like us see this vote. We plan to vote for the subdivision model.

Donald P. Wharton (Plymouth State College): The long-term interest of Division III is to hang together. If we don't, then surely we will hang separately. Now that we finally have gotten what we have long desired—more control over our destiny—we should now make further changes only in the most prudent fashion.

I think we should give the enhancements, which is not a model, it is something that is scheduled to occur, a chance to work and see if it does not do positive things for the division. I think that subgroups or subdivisions will inevitably lead to a breakup of Division III. It's most important for all our programs to move closer to the Division III model, not to begin to diverge and to quarrel over what that philosophy is. I urge us to go with enhancements and to resist subdivision and subgroupings. Thank you. (Applause)

J. Barron Bremner (Coe College): Our choice of terms and our choice of words and our choice of euphemisms can convey quite disparate nuances to an audience.

If I tell my granddaughter I had to take her kitty down to Dr. Smith and put him to sleep, it leaves quite a different impression on her than if I told her I took the cat to the vet and had it killed by lethal injection. I mention that for two reasons. One, as we talked about the enhanced model, I think all three are enhanced. I'd like to call them the enhanced status quo, an enhanced subgrouping and an enhanced subdivision so we don't infer that one is enhanced where another isn't. The other is that I've heard some of my colleagues talk about in a subdivision that AA, A and AAA, or whatever, might infer superiority or inferiority. I would like to point out again our choice of words. We can call them anything we want. We can call them American and Federal or red and blue or any title that does not imply any kind of a hierarchy. I think that's what we're looking for everyone to think about.

Peter H. Cressy (University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth): I would like, in a slightly different way, to second the comments of my distinguished colleague, the president at Plymouth State.

I think you have to be very careful that the tail does not wag the dog here. As we look at the proposition of voting for an Option 1 or Option 2, I think we run the risk of exactly what my colleague stated—of beginning to divide us at a time when we need to be very strong and to come together. The whole notion of a national championship is sort of useful. It has a nice feel for our athletes. In getting there, I think we want to be sure that the technicalities really don't fracture

us. I particularly worry a lot that we don't lose the opportunity for the publics and the privates to cross over, play together from time to time and have the option to create even more diversity within our conference.

If there is a way—and I urge you to consider it—that we can vote for enhancement and if there's a way for us within the Presidents Commission legislation to voice our objection to both 1 and 2, I think many of us would appreciate it. Thank you.

Jeff A. Ankrom (Wittenberg University): I'd like to speak in favor of a "yes" vote on the first straw vote. A "yes" vote on our first straw poll will allow us to have binding votes on these important questions at the 1998 Convention. It will also give us proper time to plan for change that is good for the whole of Division III. We can then put the next year to good effect preparing legislation, holding regional forums and preparing for next year's Convention.

Why do I urge a "yes" vote on the first straw poll? I believe we can break this assembly into three groups. First, there are those, like myself, who believe that subdivision or subgrouping would be good for Division III in the long run. I will make no more substantive arguments to this group. Second, there are those among us who are now convinced that both subdivision and subgrouping is a bad thing for Division III now and in the long run. I do respect your position and will make no arguments at this time to try to convince you. But the third group among you is to whom I now speak. I've talked to a number of you recently who say that you believe that subdivision or subgrouping would represent positive change; however, you have legitimate concerns about how change could be implemented. My main point is that if this third group votes "yes" on the first straw poll, we can make a firm legislative decision next year. There will be time to address your concerns. Let me also remind you of some basic facts.

First, what we have called championship enhancements, as the other speakers have emphasized, is not a third model to be compared to subdivision or subgrouping. This is an accomplished fact. No one has raised a single objection to enhancements, either within the task force or from outside it. All we have heard is that they claim we have not tried enhancements and, therefore, it's too early to tell if we need subdivision or subgrouping. Furthermore, subgrouping is something that can be introduced by the membership at any time through the new championships structure. In this sense, it is not really a contender model either. It requires no legislation. What this vote is really about is subdivision.

If you vote "yes" on the first straw poll, you're not closing the door on anything. You can still vote subdivision legislation up or down next year after seeing the real thing. But if you vote "no" on the first straw poll, you will be closing the door. I urge you to continue the discussion by voting "yes" on the first straw poll and give our Presidents Commission the information they need by registering your preferences on the second straw poll.

Loris Groover (Bennett College): I also support the actions of the presidents and what they are trying to do. They're just trying to create a fair playing ground for Division III. As it stands, some of us smaller colleges that do not have resources that the rest of you have would never have the opportunity to compete in a championship because we can't compete against the different levels within our division.

This is not trying to divide the division. It's trying to make it better for everyone that's part of the division. My college would never make it to the championship round because we could never compete against the colleges that are set up to compete with the best. The college I graduated from competed in Division I every year. If we won our conference every year, we'd never make it past the

first round because we'd never beat the University of Kentucky. They're trying to make it more fair in what we're doing. We do not have to vote permanently that we're going to accept these models. They're just asking for an opportunity to work on something that may prove better next year. We don't have to vote on anything that will be permanent. This is not etched in stone. Someone may come up with a better model next year that may work. Although the enhancement may work well enough this year, we may decide in January of next year that there's no need to use those other models. Let's at least give it an opportunity to see what it is that they can do with the other two models so that perhaps it might improve the situations that we have. Whether we like it or not, as large as Division III is getting, we are going to eventually have to divide because there is no way that all of us will be able to compete when we get to the size that 16 would not be enough. (Applause)

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): I want to make sure that as we consider the options that are before us that we're not confusing "access to" with "success at" national championships. I think there's a significant difference as we approach this.

Secondly, although it makes a unique numerical equivalency if you take enrollment size and sports sponsorship, it shows how we numerically come out in another light. But as we all know in this division, that does not say anything about us as comparable institutions because we all have unique characteristics based on how we do things in the institution as a whole. Whether we do it in subdivisions or subgroups, it's strictly a numerical equivalent and it has nothing necessarily to do with like institutions. So the access issue is being addressed by the committee. That's what we asked for last year—access to fully funded national championships. Well, we've got them. They can send us a national championship trophy. We can play it all down in every sport and then at the end of the year we can all send back the trophy if we don't think we deserve it. Maybe that would make us all happy because we'd have at least an instant of success.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Just a point of clarification. It's my understanding that subgrouping could happen at any time merely by action of the Championships Committee. Is it a realignment? If the region were realigned to include the conferences, no legislation is necessary? We already had one speaker speak to that. If that's the case, I'm not sure why that's a part of the debate. We've got the enhancement model already there. It's not a model. It's in place. Subdivision is the only thing that really should be a debatable situation for the membership. If we vote for subgrouping, we may never be asked to address that again because it would be done by the Championships Committee, is that correct?

Mr. Appleton: The question is does the authority rest within the Council at this point to take action on the subgrouping. The answer technically is "yes." On the other hand, this is a matter of such policy change and financial consideration that it would come back to the body for your vote before such a change were implemented. Dan, would you add to that, please?

Daniel T. Dutcher (NCAA Staff): I think Jim has stated it well. For formal subdivision to take place, you would actually see a formal subdivision legislative forum. Because subgrouping is such a fundamental change in championships policy and because of the financial ramifications—you don't need actual legislation to create championships groups—but the presidents indicated they would want that to occur as a formal vote of the membership, which would probably take the form of a resolution.

Mr. Carter: I think whatever happens, we need to regain our focus. The impor-

tant thing is the conference and regional competition. We seem to have lost that somewhere along the way.

Laurie Priest (Mount Holyoke College): I'm concerned about the way in which the three options have been presented. They aren't three equal options, and I support what John Schael said in regard to separating the vote in three ways. I said this in the earlier session, we never permitted ourselves to let parliamentary procedure keep us from doing the right thing. It seems to me that there are a number of people who are supportive of taking a small step first.

Enhancements will be in place for next year. We'll see how that works before we move on to other options. My concern about moving to a second vote between subdivisions and subgroups is that then it will be a snowball going downhill.

With all due respect to the presidents, it's my understanding that the Division III task force supports enhancements and not either subgrouping or subdivisions. It's the presidents who are supporting a move toward one or the other.

One of the concerns that I've had all along is that I think Division III athletics administrators have always done what's right for the student-athletes. One of the reasons for the whole restructuring and the move to bring presidents into the governance of the NCAA in recent years is because of some of the abuses and problems we've seen with our Division I colleagues and things that have happened at larger schools. I've always been a bit offended that the presidents have come in to have a strong voice within this group. And I would really like us to listen to our colleagues within Division III, our own administrators and where they're coming from. It seems to me that parliamentary procedure doesn't have any impact on straw votes. If the division wanted to, it could establish a straw vote.

I'm not so sure why you're presenting the straw vote as you are. I'm wondering why we can't look at it in a different way. I'd ask you to consider that. Thank you. (Applause)

Stephen R. Bamford (Plymouth State College): I would like to speak to the membership this afternoon on behalf of the Division III Football Committee pursuant to the three restructuring proposals currently under consideration.

As chair of the committee, we understand fully that the final vote on these proposals will come at next year's Convention. However, we would urge the membership's consideration and support for the removal of football from the other seven team sports packaged together under championships restructuring and to treat it as a separate sport.

We ask this of the membership for several reasons. First of all, of the seven other team-sport championships, they all can be conducted within the three-week postseason window regardless of the number of teams participating and regardless of the extent of increased access and bracket expansion.

Conversely football, as was stated earlier today and as stated in President Carter's packet memo, is unique in that postseason tournament play is limited to only one game per week. Secondly, the committee's concerned that only half of the Division III membership sponsors football. Therefore, by keeping it in the eight-team mix, a significant number of institutions not sponsoring football will be determining the future of Division III football championships.

The third concern is about the apparent lack of knowledge, understanding and input demonstrated by the Division III football coaches. I can illustrate this point by relating my experience with the Division III football coaches at their convention last week in Orlando. At the Division III business meeting, with 68 head football coaches in attendance, a lengthy discussion ensued regarding the championships models and their potential impact on Division III football. After

considerable discussion and a question-and-answer period and a synopsis of the three models, a vote was taken.

The vote was overwhelmingly in favor of the enhancement package—63 to 5. That's the system now in place without access to any number of new teams to the tournament format. This is an indication, I think, by the football coaches. I understand that a similar vote was taken at the baseball coaches convention. They were unanimously in favor of the enhancement package as well.

This is an indication among the coaches. They're certainly an important constituency group. They are not at all comfortable with either the subgrouping or subdivision models and feel strongly that these proposals are not in the best interests of Division III football or Division III baseball and its student-athletes in those sports.

With reference to the upcoming straw vote, the Division III Football Committee strongly supports the enhancement proposal and is unanimously in opposition to both the subgrouping and subdivision models. We urge you to vote in support for the status quo and Division III unity. Thank you.

Julie Fernandez (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is happy that the membership is working so diligently to increase opportunities for student-athletes by increasing access to championships. It is our feeling that the enhancement model accomplishes this with the least disruption to the alliance of our member institutions. Although we are excited about the dedication that has been displayed by the subcommittee in working to increase opportunities, we hesitate to encourage any division of our division. (Applause)

Rosalie Resch (University of Chicago): There are many of us who have concerns about the subdivision and subgrouping vote. I would encourage the Presidents Council to use the voting devices in the analysis of this second vote. When it analyzes the subdivision, subgrouping, it will have recognized that some people who are voting against those two options want something beyond enhancement. You will be able to know what that group of people wants. You will also know that those institutions who vote against proposals beyond enhancement as proposed want.

Ms. Sweet: In my four-minute sprint this morning, I didn't have an opportunity to share with you a couple of comments that I had hoped to express. I would like to do that right now.

There was reference made to the position of the task force on all three proposals. I did share with you how impressed I have been with the diligence and commitment of all of the members of the task force in trying to do the right thing for Division III. When the task force voted as to what it felt the best approach should be, the vote was 18 to 3 in favor at this time of the enhancement model. I think that's significant information. They've studied, they've worked diligently, and that's where they feel we should be right now. As has been expressed, the subgrouping and the subdividing use arbitrary divisions. There are some people who like those divisions. There are other people who do not like those divisions. While one group becomes more homogeneous in the subdivision model, the other group becomes even more diverse. You have the very large universities with the very, very small universities.

I hope that we can look at this from the perspective of all Division III institutions. There also has been a parallel drawn in a I-A, I-AA approach, similar to what takes place in Division I football. The statement was made that it works. I can tell you from my experience as president working with Division I members that the politics between Division I-A and I-AA and I-AAA have led to the

division in this Association. I would hate for that to happen with Division III.

At this point in our juncture, with the changes that are taking place in governance, we need to stay together and work together to come up with what will be best for us in the future.

One other point. The two models—the subgrouping and the subdivision—remove the self-selection option. Something is going to determine where we are, not what's right for our institution, but some other arbitrary factors. I would encourage you to send a clear message on what you feel is right for Division III at this point in our history. Look to the future and determine how we can ultimately wind up where we feel we should be in the most productive way. Thank you. (Applause)

David G. Carter (Eastern Connecticut State University): If you recall two years ago when I was elected chair of Division III, I said to you: "Let's not give way to paranoia."

Do you remember that? I said that. I said: "Let's not allow fear to determine our destiny. Rather, let us objectively deal with the issues that are before us." I would hope that my athletics director does not see me as encroaching on athletics. Whether I like it or not, it is my responsibility and the responsibility of every president to provide oversight for a total institution. If we want athletics to be viewed as important as English, math and the other programs that take place within a university, then athletics must give way, as the others have given way as well. Leadership isn't easy. You don't always do what you would like to do. My favorite animal, Kermit the Frog, says: "It's not easy being green, but it's a fact of life." It's a fact of life now that we are responsible for athletics within Division III. All presidents may not like that, but that's where we are.

This is an opportunity for you to clearly communicate to us your thinking. We want to hear from you. Don't deny yourself that opportunity to participate. I am convinced that in the final analysis we will chart the proper course. I've been serving in some form or fashion for about six years now, 5½ on the Commission. I can assure you that while we may debate each other, in the final analysis, we care about Division III and what it's committed to.

A straw vote. What is it? It's to give us a sense of your thinking. If a course is charted, we will all have a chance to participate during the ensuing year and vote in January of 1998 if it is necessary. I'd urge you to not give way to fear. Let us remember that we care about each other, because today you may be in Institution A and tomorrow Institution B. The beauty of being a president, you learn that you're temporal at best and never permanent. Thank you.

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division III task force, I, along with about 23 others, have labored over the last four years on your behalf and on behalf of all of our student-athletes in Division III. The task force has people on it who have different ideas about what's best for our student-athletes. We've had long discussions. I think, as David Carter just said, we all have their interests at heart. We all may come in from a different angle.

I think, as we've seen here unfortunately, while we've worked for four years, a number of you are just... We haven't done a good job of educating our membership. It's obvious today that some of you have not seen a lot of the subdivision and subgrouping models. That's probably our fault. We should have done more education. However, we have been talking about this for quite some time. This debate in the last 20 minutes has kind of taken on the proportions of a real vote. I would just encourage you to remember to give us a chance to develop it one more year. As we said in our breakout session, we have some opportunities

to look at the names, to look at the models again. This isn't the final vote. It will be January of '98 if you give us an opportunity. We've worked for four years on behalf of Division III. Give us the opportunity to take that vote in January of '98. Thank you.

Daniel L. Bridges (California Institute of Technology): I want to try to clarify the voting line because I know there is considerable confusion over that. I think it might be helpful if the membership understands that Question No. 2, which will be asked today, was essentially mandated by the presidents. They asked us to get a sense from the membership which of those two models you would prefer—subdivision or subgrouping—period. They didn't want to know anything else at this time.

The task force decided that it would be wise at the same time to ask the question: Do you feel it's necessary or do you feel that the time is right to move beyond enhancements? Thus, we get the two-question situation. The task force didn't feel as if it had the power or the option to go to something as Laurie or John suggested earlier. We felt very clearly and we're living up to the mandate given to us by the presidents—put it before the membership; which of these two models you prefer, subdivision or subgrouping. So it may be helpful if you think of them as completely independent questions.

One question is really coming from the presidents. The first question: "Do you feel that we need to go beyond enhancements at this time?" is really a task force question. If you will consider those completely independent of one another, I think we will get the desired effect. Perhaps that's helpful. I hope so. We can get on and vote. Thank you.

Mr. Appleton: I have just a couple of concluding comments before we move to a straw vote.

I respect very much the kind of comments, questions and the way that we have added to this discussion. With the greatest respect for Judith, I think the vote of the task force is irrelevant to this conversation. It was our task to put together options for the membership to look at so that the leadership coming up next year would have the opportunity to take a very good look at what the next directions should be of this organization. Both questions on which you'll have the opportunity to have a straw vote are very important to us. I look forward to the results of those. I think both will be very helpful as we move forward. In any case, it will not be the last time we talk about enhancements, no matter how we define them in Division III. Thank you for your good work.

Ms. Belgiovine: We are now ready to conduct straw votes on the championship models. We will vote on two separate questions. We will also display each of the questions on the overheads for you to see. We will be using the voting machines to conduct the straw vote as a guidance to our presidents. We need to view this as the opportunity for the membership to provide feedback. Please turn on your voting units.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): May I ask why this vote has to be taken in the last five minutes of this session when we have an entire session tomorrow morning? This has not been published. It's not been designated for a roll-call vote by the presidents. It's a straw vote. Why does this straw vote have to be taken now when we have an entire session to continue what I think is one of the most important discussions that's been going on in the 20 years I've been here?

Ms. Belgiovine: It's part of the Presidential Agenda Day. Presidents have mandated that this vote occur today. Many of them do leave the Convention following today's agenda. Not to be negative, but this really now begins another year

of dialogue. Because we have this five-minute time frame to take a vote does not preclude further dialogue on the issue. In fact, it encourages increased dialogue and involvement on the issue.

Mr. Gordon: I'll vote, but I don't like it.

[*Note: The electronic voting system malfunctioned.*]

Ms. Belgiovine: While the brain trust is attempting to figure out the voting units, permit me to just make a couple of statements about what just occurred this afternoon. Please know that the steering committee and the Presidents Commission, as we move into the new structure, will be working together. Despite everything that's being said and everything that you may say, we, as colleagues, will not let that relationship deteriorate. We will work together. I know for a fact that the members of the steering committee are committed to a direction. Your involvement, comments and feedback will be important to that process. Despite how you may feel walking out of here, please know that there is a commitment to this division wherever it goes.

There's one more trick we're going to try with the voting units. If that does not work President Carter has indicated—as the presidents are the only body who can make this decision—we will reconvene in the morning and the first item of business will be to vote on these two questions.

At this point, we'll bring President David Carter forward to make a decision about the vote.

Mr. Carter: As you're aware, this is a particular item that's very, very important to us. However, the machine is the machine. We're going to move the vote to tomorrow. I request that it be the first item that's considered because it does not make sense to keep you here while we are working to fix something that may not work and end up frustrating everyone.

Ms. Belgiovine: Turn the voting units off. I remind the delegates that the general business session is beginning immediately in the Delta Ballroom. We will reconvene our session tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. in this room.

[The Division III discussion session was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.]

DISCUSSION SESSION

The Division III discussion session was called to order by Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University, at 1:45 p.m.

Mr. Carzo: Let me welcome you and assure you that the committee wants to respond to your concerns. We have someone here from each of the three presentation groups this morning. In addition, we've collected your questions and categorized them in a way that we can get some general discussion started on concerns you might have expressed.

We can start by telling you the things we talked about during break and some of the information you passed on to us in regard to general questions. One of the questions that came up quite frequently was: "Can the final model of subdivision be adjusted? Is it concrete? Is it flexible? Is there any method or design for adjustment as we move along?"

We'll pass that on to Kitty Baird and ask her if she would like to respond to that just to get things started.

Kitty R. Baird (Centre College): As far as the model is concerned, it is a model that is being proposed. If you feel as if we should go to the concept of subdivision, you will have time after this Convention to give us feedback, both now and in the next weeks. It will be refined. It's not set in stone at this point. There can be some modifications. We wanted to be fair, just and make the best program for everyone.

Deborah McGrath (Colby-Sawyer College): Can I ask for clarification? What we've been talking about at lunch is if it's a given that we're going into the enhancement model for 1997 and 1998. Are we being pushed to decide between the subdivision or subgrouping? What if we would like to see the enhancement model continue for more than just one year? Are we putting ourselves down the road into subdivision or subgrouping without being able to come back?

Ms. Baird: No. I will try to answer that. At this point, we do want to know if you are interested in going further. But we also want to know if a large number of you are interested in going further. If you don't want to go further, we want to know which one of these two models you would prefer so that this one might be developed by the Championships Committee and the Presidents Commission to be brought forward at the next Convention.

At the next Convention, you would have an opportunity then to say no, I don't like whatever comes forward and I want to stay with what we have. That's fine. That's when a vote that counts will be taken.

Linda E. Hoppie (Middle Atlantic States Conference): To me, the easiest way to look at it is if you think in terms of a four-team tournament and the enhancement package has the bye. It's already out in the second round. The subgrouping and the subdivision groups are the ones that we're initially asking: Of those two, which one do you prefer? At that point, the one that you prefer would be refined. Then at a later date, you would be weighing that one with the enhanced package.

Mr. Carzo: Regardless of the nature of the two questions that are going to be asked of you at a later time, that is going to be discussed at great length as to how you will vote and what that vote will mean. The important thing is to make sure that we get as much information as possible from you. That's the idea. The enhancement package, as you know, is in. We need to know about the other two packages from you; whether you want to do that or you have a preference. We need to have a response in that second part. That will be reviewed later this afternoon.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I'm wondering what the percentage might have to be on the first question of enhancement that would stop the process of looking at subdivision or subgrouping. Let me just propose that if it's 51-49 for enhancement, that there seems to be a reasonable expectation. We would then want to figure out what the member wanted with subgrouping or subdivision. To propose another model, if it was 95-5 that enhancement was all we wanted, would we still ask the second question? If the answer to that is "yes," what do those of us who don't want either do? We don't have a third option. We can abstain but that will result in an unrecorded vote. I'm fearful that down the road if 20 percent vote for subgrouping and 19 percent vote for subdivision and 68 percent abstain, we'll be told the largest number of votes was for subgrouping or subdivision.

Mr. Carzo: That's a very good question. It's very complicated. First of all, you will not find the results of the first vote out before you vote for the second one. So that's part of it. In terms of the discussion that we've had in the committee, the idea was if there's an overwhelming majority to favor a particular model, then there would be no need for it. If there's a question or any decision by virtue of the percentages, the results will go to the Presidents Commission, which will decide whether or not to offer the second alternative. The second alternative, if indeed there is going to be another alternative, is based on one of the two models you see. We would like for you to vote on the second part without knowing what happened to the first part simply to get an honest response and a very good

percentage response.

Linda S. Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): I think this is probably the most pressing question that we've heard over the last couple of days. What exactly does our vote mean? What will the process be once the vote is over?

We will clarify that in totality when we come back together. But I just want to reiterate what Rocky has said because there's really been a lot of confusion. We really want the two votes to be separate. If you feel strongly that the enhancement model is what you want now and maybe down the road, you want to make sure that you vote no on that first question because the question will be: "Do you favor something beyond enhancements?" The presidents are asking a separate question from No. 2 for our position on each of the two models that were presented today—the subdivision and the subgrouping. So we're not going to rank, but it will not be in our best interest to abstain, even if you feel strongly about enhancements. We need to hear if we should proceed? If we proceed because if you do not vote either way and abstain, there is no way of knowing if you support enhancements. So even if you prefer enhancements, it will be very important that you indicate which of the two other models—should there be a decision by the presidents to move forward—you would prefer that we develop legislation for. You may not agree with that procedure, but that is in essence how we want to get the correct information and really know how you feel. Please do not abstain, no matter how you feel about enhancements. Let us know which of those two other choices you prefer.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you, Linda. Let me reassure you, from the beginning of this restructuring process, we reiterated to you constantly that we need information from you. That's the way we've proceeded.

Arthur Eason (William Patterson College): Can enhancements be enhanced? We didn't enhance basketball. Presently it's 64. We're going to go back to 48, correct?

Mr. Carzo: That's correct.

Mr. Eason: Why couldn't we have stayed with 64? On the other hand football is out of whack. Basketball is very popular. Why could we not have stayed 64 with basketball since we are keeping football at 16?

Ms. Moulton: It's two separate questions, Arthur. One is basketball. The other is how much can the enhancements be enhanced? Remember the decision was made to only look at those eight team sports that had sponsorship of 200 members or more. That, in fact, in my remarks today, I said maybe we need to look at whether or not 200 is the magic number. After the Convention is over, that whole issue will go to the sport committees and the Championship Committee to review carefully not only the eight sports that we've already made some decisions about, but the other sports where there have been questions—whether it's individual or any number of issues that come up. The process calls for the individual sports committees and the Championships Committee to look at that issue. One of the questions that came up from the sheets was: "How much more can we enhance and still retain the ratio and the three-week time period that we have suggested that championships be conducted in?" We could still maintain the 1-8 ratio and still move to a membership of 512 institutions. There's still considerable opportunity for us, even with discussion about membership growth, to have another 100-some members come into Division III and be able to have each of those brackets and those eight sports field as many as 64 teams. That's what we could accommodate.

As for the basketball issue, adhering to both the sport ratio—1 to 8 and 1 to 12—and having fully funded championships, did impact basketball. Does that

mean that it can't be removed? No, but it does mean effective next year that will certainly be the legislation that we will need to live with if the membership so decides or the Championships Committee or the sports committee want to continue to review that, that is the appropriate place for that to be reviewed. Next year we will live with the 48-team bracket. I want to reiterate that we really felt it was important to treat all of the sports consistently in terms of the application of the ratio and the fully funded championship.

Louis A. Barone (Baldwin-Wallace College): Let me further complicate it. When the chips fall where they may, is there any contemplation to somehow subdivide in certain sports or individual sports? Would that be something that's been contemplated?

Mr. Carzo: I think it's a very good question that relates to the previous question. As you said, it complicates it a little bit.

We spent a great deal of time in the task force discussing the possibility of expansion and where we go. Indeed, that's one of the reasons for drawing up a set of principles or parameters that allow us to stay with the 1-to-8 ratio we talked about and the three-week period for sports that are played more than once a week. The funding was available to us. By virtue of the restructuring, we arrived at a figure somewhere around 500 teams. That gives us enough flexibility for another year or two. But what happens when you get beyond that point? It's clear that somewhere along the line if we continue to grow that we'll have to break into A and B. We're not going to destroy the ratios though because we felt that was the most reasonable thing to assure our student-athletes and our constituency that one out of every eight teams would have championship representation possibility.

John M. Schael (Washington University, Missouri): I have a question in reference to subdivision. In terms of how the determination was made with respect to the numbers that are used, institutions with an enrollment of either male or female students over 1,000 go one way and institutions with enrollments of under 500 go another way. The "in-betweeners" will be divided up not equally, but they will go one direction or another. Can someone respond to that? I mean what's so magical about 1,000 or less than 500?

Ms. Baird: I'm not sure it's a magic number. It seemed to be that this sort of fit the very small colleges versus the larger schools and made the ratio between the two divisions not fall less than 40-60 percent.

Mr. Schael: Bear with me for a second. I did some calculations. I'm not a mathematician. There are 180 schools with enrollments of 1,000. If I came up with institutions with enrollments less than 500, there are 65 of those. Of those 65, 13 are provisional members who will be coming into the NCAA. In the "in-between" division, you had 42 percent of your institutions or another 181 schools. So at the front end, with the 1,000 enrollment you have 42 percent of your member institutions. At the opposite end of the continuum, you only had 15 percent. To me, it seems as though there's a more reasonable number to reach if you really want to have true equity in Division III and it's the membership's desire to go with a subdivision model. That figure might be 800 or 900. I think it gives you a clearer mandate. It's certainly fair because if you do your division, then you end up with 181. If I just use my 800 figure, I end up with 181 institutions with 1,000 or more enrolled students. If I go all the way over to the far end, I would end up with 191 institutions. "In-between," I would only have 65 institutions to deal with and I can move them from one direction or another.

I also think that the subdivision model is inherently unfair to the small institutions. When we talk about institutions that have enrollments of 500 or less,

they are discriminated against because they are penalized. They don't have enough students to put six or seven team sports out for NCAA competition. As such, they get penalized by being placed in the larger-school division.

Ms. Baird: But you are looking at just one sex there. So if you are taking 500, then you possibly have an enrollment of 1,000. But with 500, you have a number of schools with 200 and 300 that have more than six.

Mr. Schael: I understand that. Some of it has to do with geography, etc. When we talk about one sex, I understand that. But I doubt there are very many institutions that want to have their women's program in A or men's program in AA or vice versa. That's some things to think about.

Mr. Carzo: John, it's a good point. We would try to get some geographical proximity and breadth of programs tied together. You are aware of those institutions.

Mr. Gordon: I would like to make a point about using 1,000 as the first criteria. It seems to me to indicate that size is the No. 1 priority or the No. 1 parameter that you want to use to divide the membership. If you do that and pick the numbers 1,000 and 500, you don't divide the membership as completely as you might with different numbers. If that is going to be the No. 1 factor that you are going to use, I think you need to pick a number that pulls a higher percentage. Raise the lower number, lower the upper number and use your most important criteria to divide two-thirds, or 70 percent of the membership, which I think you can do by adjusting up or down from a thousand to 900 or from 500 up to 550 or 600. If that's your No. 1 criteria it pulls more of the membership solely based on the size, which you are saying right now is the No. 1 criteria.

Peter H. Cressy (University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth): As chancellor at the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, I have got a modest program of 24 varsity sports. I just want to look back for a second. I've only been to two of these Conventions in the last four years. Like most CEOs, I kind of come in and out of these arguments.

As we get into the technical piece of this, I think it's worth pausing a moment to be absolutely certain that in the end we decide this on some sort of fundamental philosophical principle about where we want to be positioned as Division III when this argument is over. I think there are a couple of things we should do. We want to be absolutely certain that the tail does not wag the dog. That's particularly important as we go into restructuring in the NCAA because overall we either have the opportunity to enhance our position on the basis of the fundamentals of student athletics or we have the opportunity to kind of get pushed aside even more by Division I and Division II.

I think we should be very careful as we go forward in this debate and discussion to not fracture ourselves in any unuseful way. As a product of a great private education umpteen years ago when I was a Division I athlete, I really want to be certain that the privates and the publics don't separate any more than they sometimes do naturally. I think it's a good idea for our students to participate with each other. I would want to be very careful that any of our divisions didn't make that happen. I think we ought to come back once in awhile and ask ourselves, what's driving us? Is national competition essential to our fundamental notions of Division III? I'm personally not against it but it does strike me that there is nothing absolutely magic about Division III having its own national championship. If we have it and we can do it in a way that is constructive, then I would be all for it. But it doesn't seem to me that that should be a driving tenet of what we're trying to do. We ought to keep coming back over and over again as to what our guiding philosophies are in Division III and where we want to be with the

student-athlete. When this is all finished, we'll be strong within the overall context of the NCAA.

I would love to hear from others, particularly some of my fellow CEOs, about their philosophy on a couple of these critical things. Perhaps some on the Presidents Commission have been debating and discussing those things. Thank you.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you very much, Peter. You've made some very good points and reinforced a lot of things we're trying to continue.

Louise O'Neal (Wellesley College): I am unhappy that I really have to put a lot of energy into figuring which of these two models I'm going to support because I see nothing wrong with the enhancement program. But politically and being realistic, I know that I need to decide which of the two worse things I want to get involved in.

I feel that with subdivision—even if it has a reason to exist—to pick some arbitrary criterion as size, you might as well—and I mean this seriously—decide to divide us by school color. I think you could come out with just as interesting mathematical possibilities as you've come up with in enrollment size. We could also even use the Division I model and use your stadium size. You would also come up with some mathematical models as to how to subdivide us. None of these are educationally based. There's one thing that we should be basing it on—program philosophy. I took our particular situation under the subdivision model to look at. You are placing colleges in a division in which the whole regular-season competition would be impacted much less. We would maybe or maybe not get into a championship. We are placed arbitrarily in a division based on a size. We play only two colleges in that subdivision in the regular season. We play those two colleges only in a couple of sports, so we're talking about four contests. We all know that when you are being considered for selection for national championships that your regular-season schedule and how well you did against the opponents in your division is looked at. Right now, I would be forced into scrapping my competitive schedule and scheduling opponents that I have never had any reason to have anything in common with before. We happen to have approximately the same enrollment size except there seems to be some arbitrariness even about that. I think this impacts on how we conduct our regular year. We should not be forced into a situation in which we have to play people based on enrollment size, not common philosophy or common breadth.

So I think that for the arbitrary subdivision by size, if we have to consider this particular model when I do not want to, that we need to come up with some other criterion that's based on program philosophy and does not impact on our regular-season scheduling so we don't have to go a considerable distance to find somebody our size. Some of you have indicated that you find yourself in a good predicament, unlike Wellesley. You happen to play all of those people, that's fine, except enrollment size is one of the most fluxional variables there are. You commit to a philosophy. You cannot always control enrollment size. You may be where you want to be now. You may be with us in a few years or you may be out of our division and down into the other division in a couple of years if your enrollment changes. We do know that demographics are changing rapidly. It points to the fallacy of some criterion that has nothing to do with what we're trying to do in our program, but instead says because you are a certain size you have to go over there. I might point out also that a single-sex college of a certain size grouped with a coed school with the same number of women has not been taken into consideration. They have placed us arbitrarily in with large colleges and universities assuming we have the same number of men. There is a difference

between a 4,000 coed and a 2,000 single-sex school. If we have to consider one of these models, let's not base them on the subdivision according to size, the second in the subgrouping.

Mr. Carzo: What was your recommendation, that it be based on the philosophy of that particular institution?

Ms. O'Neal: Program breadth. I'm being forced into coming up with something I have no interest in coming up with. I do think national championships are enhanced and will continue to improve. That's what I would prefer. In terms of the subgrouping, it seems like a good thing taken to an extreme. It does seem to try to find commonality, but it is so homogeneous that I think it destroys the opportunity for some amount of variance in your thinking. I hate to see us have to consider both models. If we do, I think we have to go with the subgrouping. At least it is able to maintain our regular-season competition and would keep us in more of a group with a common interest.

Stephen R. Bamford (Plymouth State College): Has there been any interest or desire by the task force to poll the membership from the eight different coaches associations that will be affected by this movement? Has that happened? Is it going to happen in the future before a decision is finally made at next year's Convention? I think their voice should be heard. I attended the NCAA Division III football coaches association meeting in Orlando last week. We took a straw vote at the end of that business session and it was 63-5 in favor of the enhancement proposal in the sport of football. Basically, the enhancement proposal as you understand it, can't be enhanced. We can't increase access given the current status quo. So they were voting in favor of the 16-team tournament with no increased access and no bracket expansion. They were scared to death of the two other proposals—the subdivision and the subgrouping models. In talking with my baseball coach, who just returned from Dallas last week from their convention, the Division III baseball coaches took a poll. They were unanimously in favor of the enhancements proposal. Again he mentioned to me that his...

Mr. Carzo: Are you saying baseball voted for it because it would help them and football voted for it because it wouldn't hurt them?

Mr. Bamford: They voted for the enhancement proposal because they were in complete opposition to the other two models. Are we going to poll the other respective coaches associations between now and the next Convention to get their feelings?

Mr. Carzo: Let me try to answer that question, Steve, without being impolite. We haven't thought about doing that. But there's no reason we can't record it and see if it can't be done. It's a complicated issue, but we certainly can respond to that.

Ms. Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): That's a great suggestion, Steve, but the enhancement package would not allow us at this time to do anything with football. We realize that we do need to look at it. We need to figure out if there's some way to adhere to the principles that we've agreed to and examine our option. Maybe it's enhancements in most sports but maybe we go to a bowl concept in football. It's important for the membership to know we've got to be as creative as possible. If we basically feel that the enhancement package is solid and it commits to all of the things we think are important, then we've got to go back to the drawing table and address specific issues with certain sports like football to figure out if there's a way to still keep that intact, but yet address the ability to have additional access. I wanted to make sure that you knew that.

Mr. Bamford: I certainly will be speaking as chair of the NCAA Division III football committee to the football issue at the 3 p.m. general membership ses-

sion. In the subdivision model, if we had four institutions in a football-playing conference that were playing in Division A, and the other three were in Division AA, where would you draw the line? You have said that you won't break up conferences. Where would that conference play its games? In Division A or Division AA?

Ms. Baird: I can answer from here. They would be in the division in which that conference is placed. The conferences would not be broken up. Therefore, all schools in the conference would play in the same division in which that conference is placed. That's where the majority...

Mr. Bamford: In a football-playing conference. If it's a sole-sport conference, that hasn't been determined yet, right?

Mr. Carzo: No.

Mr. Bamford: Is that correct?

Ms. Baird: Right.

Mr. Bamford: So we don't know where we're going to be playing?

Ms. Baird: It will be where the majority of the schools belong.

Mr. Bamford: Thank you.

Mr. Cressy: Some of my colleagues have asked me as a CEO to emphatically remake the point Steve has just made. We're very concerned and nervous about being asked to vote for two options in a manner that we think is inappropriate and don't support. There may be something we simply don't understand.

At this point, we're in favor of making things better by pursuing enhancement. But the group of five or six of us who are sitting back here are not the slightest bit interested at this point in having to vote on either of those other two options. We're worried about a technicality forcing us into sounding like we're supporting something that we're not. I think it is important to at least clarify that.

Samuel R. Williamson (University of the South): I'm on the Presidents Commission. Let me try to address that issue and a series of other issues that have come up. I thought it was accurately described earlier. I want to applaud the work of the committee. You worked very hard. We gave you a mandate in the spring. We pushed you in June. We will push you the next time we meet. The enhancement package was never considered to be the end of the railroad, the end point. It was considered to be a point toward something but not the end station.

Unidentified Delegate: By whom? It's the presidents who are looking at those two other models.

Mr. Williamson: Yes. These two models have been discussed extensively. I think in either case—the second option, grouping of division—they have got to be refined regardless of what the details are. Some interesting and useful ideas have come up in discussion this afternoon that are going to be looked at. But the feeling was we needed to have some sense of direction. If you have an issue over here and vote it up or down, the issues are not going to go away. The Presidents Commission made it very clear in April that it wanted to have championships in which you had similar institutions playing similar schools for a championship with proportional access. For awhile, it would work with the enhanced package, but it won't work indefinitely. The enhanced package does not address the second principle. You asked for similar schools competing for the championship. The grouping of subdivisions would be going toward that. We looked at those very carefully to see what the opinion is. We played this game. We had three, four and five models and we came back to these two. There's a philosophy of things and you get into metaphysics very quickly. We stated num-

bers, sports sponsorships and enrollments because those are more statistical. You could explain those easily.

Mr. Carzo: I encourage you to speak in the next session.

Mr. Cressy: With so many of us coming in and out of this issue...

You are quite right, the Commission and the committee have worked terribly hard on it. Those of us who don't focus on this until the last minute deserve a good slap on the wrist to be sure. I would be very appreciative if you could give us 30 seconds of what was behind the presidents' thinking about two points here.

Why is the notion of a national championship a good idea? As I say, I'm not against it. I would just like to get 30 seconds of why it's a good idea. How does that help us? Secondly, in terms of this overall picture of where we sit within the NCAA organization, what do you think would most enhance our capacity to help yourselves within the NCAA organization?

Mr. Williamson: I shouldn't be the only person to respond to this. Carter is over there. When I came on, it was a given that the national championship pattern was something that would be useful. I did not, however, think it useful for institutions of enormous disparate size playing in the final game. I thought that was inherently unfair to the athletes and so forth. As for the second thing, what can we do as a division, the first thing we can do is get more CEOs to meet.

Mr. Cressy: Some of us are trying.

Mr. Williamson: We've got to have this because you are rediscovering the wheel every time you have a new set of presidents. I think Division III needs to put together a program that shows in exemplary fashion that we're concerned about the student-athlete. We're concerned about equity. We're concerned about doing things very clearly philosophically, but not try to pretend that there aren't some problems. This issue we're trying to deal with—with the division, sub-grouping or enhancement—has been a root issue for more than a decade in Division III. We have big schools, small schools, private, public, so forth. This is an attempt to come to grips with it before they lose more members from the NAIA, and that's going to be around the corner. If we don't solve the problem this year, it's going to come back up two or three years from now. We're trying to look at and think about it constructively between now and next January.

Mr. Cressy: Sam, do you think you could convince David or one of the other presidents to comment on what the philosophy behind it was? You said you went into the meeting with the idea it was a done deal.

Mr. Williamson: Personally, I can see the reason why you would have it.

Robert W. Neff (Juniata College): There is not a monolithic view of this. It's my view that student-athletes want to finally take a measure of themselves against other institutions. I prefer—and I don't mind stating this publicly—the sub-grouping model because it holds the only possibility of student-athletes competing against all within the division, which I favor. I think it extends the conference mode into keeping like institutions playing together for as long as possible in championship competition. I'm stating my personal view of that.

I do think student-athletes want to know where they stand at the end of a season and they want to know where they stand with the complete arena in which they are competing. That's the views I have expressed on my campus. I think that's consistent with the Division III philosophy, which carries a lot of different institutions with a common philosophy. That's why I've taken this position.

Mr. Cressy: I agree with that sort of notion for national competition. I like the idea if the costs can be cropped.

On the issue of like institutions playing each other for as long as possible, is there a chance in that approach to lose a certain amount of diversity and a mix-

ing of our different campuses in a way that would be very useful? It was one thing when I was at Yale. Everybody had gone to prep school. Everybody was in a private this or that. We made a great distinction, but today—we look at things differently. People have a whole variety of options among public or private schools. I'm wondering whether it's a good distinction. Bob, I felt very strongly about the championship to maintain a sense of diversity. I believe that very deeply as a philosophical principle. I'm very concerned about any view of elitism or separatism. That, in my mind, runs counter to the very nature to the education we all wish to sponsor and encourage.

Mr. Neff: From my perspective, the subgrouping model provided a way to deal with some of the issues within our body. At the same time it held up the principle of diversity because at some time in competition we're all going to be competing against one another. To my mind, that principle was upheld. If I felt for a moment that the issue of diversity were not upheld, I would be against my model because I think the power and the real distinction of this group is its diversity. I felt one model attempted to deal with some concerns within our constituency and at the same time uphold very important principles to me. One, that our student-athletes want to be able to compete against one another in the full field. Secondly, we have to deal with some part of the championship program and that's why I favored a particular model.

Mr. Cressy: Thank you very much. I really appreciate it.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you. Let me thank the two chief executive officers for sharing that information with us. I can assure you without any equivocation whatsoever that the task force spent many, many hours discussing those issues with the guidance and input from the Presidents Commission. We found ourselves in a dilemma a lot of the time simply because we felt that the championship experience in itself was a wholesome atmosphere and environment for our student-athletes, provided it was conducted within the right framework. We found that in order for that to be a quality experience, there had to be equitable competition. Trying to get equitable competition in our breadth of programs—geographical and the general philosophical issues that you've heard here—is an enormous task. We've made a lot of progress. We're at a really good stage to have some options, to review them and share with you how difficult those problems are. They are difficult because they are diverse. We'll continue to preserve that in the two models. One model is more homogeneous than the other. But other than that, I think we're adhering to the general principles that have been passed on to this committee.

Mr. Schael: I will just say one thing. I will save my remarks for the other session.

We have three buttons on the voting device. Why would the presidents not allow us to press "yes" if we like the enhance bracket, "no" if we like subdivision and "abstain" if we like subgrouping? Then we compare one right against the other.

Mr. Neff: Should we refer that question to the next session because they asked us to do so?

Mr. Schael: The presidents had nothing to do with this decision?

Mr. Carzo: Thank you.

Steven F. Ulrich (Centennial Conference): I want to get back to a point Louise made. In the early days of this process, some members of the task force stated their concern that the index model, which used a sliding scale based on a relationship between enrollment and sports sponsorship, was deemed too complex for this group and that the way it was assigned was too arbitrary. These con-

cerns led to the 1,000 figure that you see for enrollment because that was thought to be more amenable to you.

I also had one other question regarding enhancements in subgrouping. How many teams are too many teams to compete for a single national championship? We heard that under subgrouping, you can go from 512 up to I think 764 or something. The further on we go, don't we find more of our athletes missing time in the classroom, missing more time away from campus?

Mr. Carzo: You are absolutely right. I think one of the principles had to be to reduce missed class time and the number of total weeks of competition.

Mr. Ulrich: I noticed in volleyball that increasing the field to 48 teams is more than likely going to require a midweek contest now. You will have 16 teams get a first-round bye. The other 32 are going to need to play on a Wednesday to advance to a regional quarterfinal setup.

Ms. Hopple: That change was to incorporate the same ratio. Volleyball's ratio was impacted very negatively. Access to championships in volleyball was much lower than in other sports. It seemed to me to be the best time, with enhancements in our new restructuring, to take a look at the ratios and make them as comparable as possible. Every attempt was made to keep it within three weeks and to have the ratio as close to 1 to 8 with the team sports as possible.

Ms. Moulton: We really tried as a task force in the Presidents Commission to address all of the concerns that you've raised over the course of the last several years. We kept hearing that access to championships was important to you. We've addressed that by looking at the size of our brackets and using the ratio that was developed several years ago. We apply it consistently, particularly with some of those sports that really have not had the kind of representation that they should, given the number of schools that are sponsoring that sport.

Maybe there's no answer. We can't have it all ways. If access, championships within a three-week period and allowing additional opportunities for our student-athletes is important to us, I do feel that the enhancement model has addressed that. If in the end we're not satisfied—it's too many opportunities, too many kids are missing class—then we need to revisit that issue. But I do feel that we've addressed that because that is what the membership has asked us to do.

Mr. Carzo: Basically, the genesis of the new models came out with the enhancement program in the original championship structure, so there was an attempt to resolve the original championship structure.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): I think I'm right in assuming that this isn't the end. The question is being asked because we've been on first base for a long time. I don't want to speak for the presidents, but they have an interesting way of getting people off of first base. Let's see what second base feels like. So it's a straw vote. It's not the real thing. The other concern I've heard is that straw votes usually wind up being the real thing. Am I right in assuming that we still have a year, that if someone in this group comes up with another brilliant idea that somehow seems to solve a lot of these problems, that it can be presented and posed at the next Convention?

Mr. Carzo: I don't think so. I think you are choosing between the two alternatives. You want to raise that question in the next session.

Mr. Johnson: I understand in the straw vote that we're choosing between these two. After that's done, the membership still has an opportunity over the next year to present.

Mr. Carzo: Absolutely. This does not close the process. The NCAA process is on and on and on.

Joyce Reighn (Rowan College of New Jersey): It's apparent there's a lot of

skepticism on what this vote actually means. Is something going to be forced upon us?

I will use basketball as an example. I believe it was three years ago this Division III body was surveyed about an enhanced championship for basketball, which is the most widely participated sport in Division III. As a member of the national basketball committee, I saw the survey. It was overwhelmingly in favor of enhancement with the agreement that they pay for that first round. We did. The last two years, men's and women's championships in basketball have been able to repay that first round—if not fully, partially. The body was surveyed, we responded with what we wanted, it was done and now it's being taken back. I think there's a good reason why there is some skepticism as to what does this vote actually mean, whether it's a straw vote or if we want enhancement.

Mr. Carzo: Your skepticism is certainly justifiable in terms of what you just stated. By the same token, it's fair to recognize one of the heaviest responses we got when we questioned all of you was to have accessibility in all championships that are fully funded for Division III. We can't have one championship where you pay your way in and not the other. It seems to me we're being inconsistent about the way we treat all of our schools. There may be some schools who can't afford to pay that fee, whatever that may be.

Kathleen LeVache (College of New Rochelle): Louise is voting for subgrouping because that's where most of her opponents happen to be placed. I would have to vote for subdivision because that's where most of my opponents are placed. In the subgrouping, 19 of my opponents are in another group. Four are in the same group that I'm in. I assume that if I'm in a group, I would be expected to compete against the teams in that group. Therefore, I would be forced as she would be forced to change my opponents. I've been playing against them for 30-some odd years. I don't wish to do that.

Ms. Hopple: Are you an independent school?

Ms. LeVache: Yes, I am.

Ms. Hopple: Then, in fact, what you are saying is correct.

Mr. Carzo: Sorry about that, Kathleen.

Lonnie Folks (Maryville University of St. Louis): When we finally decide one way or the other what we're going to do, what message, if any, will we send back to the sports committees that will decide how these championships brackets are played? All of the basketball conferences' champions were given automatic qualifications for the NCAA tournament with the enhancement bracket. We're dropping from 64 to 48. If that's what we will end up with, will that still be the situation or will the sports committees be left to decide who and how many from each particular part of the country or from which conference are allowed into the tournaments?

Mr. Carzo: My impression is that they would still have that flexibility, Lonnie. I don't think they are going to allow them to go beyond the numbers, though.

Mr. Folks: I'm not asking about beyond the numbers. One of the criteria when we voted in the 64-team field was that every conference that sponsored the sport would get an opportunity to play in the tournament. Will that still be the case?

Mr. Carzo: I understood what you said. I'm trying to avoid the broad question of automatic qualifiers because eventually we'll end up talking about it. If each conference, each division, each championship has automatic qualifiers, how do we take care of independent schools? That is a very large, complex question and we've done a lot of thinking. I would be misleading you if I told you there was any definite decision. I'm sorry for backing off.

David Wells (Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges): Addendum

D to the subdivision model has championship opportunities for 1995-96. I will vote for subgrouping like the president of the university who spoke prior to me.

When you talk about access opportunities, are these numbers you see in that column pretty much standard? I thought I read that for four or five years in a row. Are they pretty standard where you are looking at 1-to-5 and 1-to-15 ratios for baseball and then men's basketball? I think women's basketball and soccer are the two team sports where the opportunities between big and small—for lack of another term—are about the same. Other than that, there are some rather large disparities. Has that been consistent in the last several years?

Mr. Carzo: That's Addendum D?

Mr. Wells: Yes. If you are looking at 1995-96 championship opportunities, when people talk about enhancement, I think that's one of the reasons why there are some people who would prefer some form of championship opportunities who did take sports sponsorship, as well as size, into account. If you look at just women's soccer, if this was true in every year, smaller schools are getting an opportunity one out of every 10 schools versus AA, one out of every 20. I thought I saw those statistics for more than one year. I'm not speaking on behalf of subdivision because I'm referring to that addendum. But that does speak to the reason why many people do feel we ought to go forward and at least pursue in the next year some form other than enhancement. We still have opportunity to choose enhancement should we wish to do so.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): As a point of information, our conference broke out participation rates and the history of Division III championships for both men and women. The statistics are available. They are compiled for all championships, all institutions, every year, not just one year, which may or may not be reflective of the total stats. They were distributed to your conference commissioners. They should have the summary sheet. We also have the individual sheets if you would like them. But there is a history of Division III championships already defined—all institutions, all years, all sports—that we're talking about.

Mr. Carzo: That's great, Chuck. Do you have copies for people?

Mr. Gordon: Dick distributed them to the conference commissioners. They should have a summary sheet for everyone, and there are individual sheets.

Mr. Carzo: Conference commissioners should have a sheet and they can be duplicated.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): Like many others, I want to applaud the task force for a marvelous job. Everyone has pleaded to put philosophy, education and participation at the top of the list in priority. I think the task force has done this.

I see two conflicts here. One is that so many of us want to keep everything we've got now that's good and yet have something different, particularly the basketball people. That can't happen. Secondly, I think the largest complaint we've all heard—after we take off philosophy, participation, education, all the interests of the student-athletes—is why do we have to compete against the big schools if we're the smaller schools? It constantly goes over and over again. Although people argue that size should not be the issue that divides us, that is the issue that divides us. I think we've got to come to grips with that issue.

Laurie Priest (Mount Holyoke College): It's been stated before about the way we're going to vote. I've talked with a number of people who believe that the way the models have been presented aren't three separate models. It seems the way we're voting is exactly that. I would encourage us to have the opportunity

to not let parliamentary procedure tie us up. In Division III, we've never really tried to do that. We could look at each model individually: Enhancement, subdivision and subgrouping.

I have a sense, maybe I'm wrong, that there are a number of people who would like to support enhancement, which will happen next year, and see how that goes before we even begin to support and move forward any other direction. I'm concerned that it's a snowball that's starting downhill and it's going to roll and go. With all due respect to the presidents—I can say this because my president isn't here—but one of the reasons that we've moved in intercollegiate athletics to have more involvement from the presidents in governing and not directors is because Division I in many ways mismanaged and didn't run programs that were in the best interest of our student-athletes. As a director of athletics administration for the last 16 years, I've found that to be unfortunate because I thought Division III, the majority of the time, made decisions in the best interest of student-athletes. I heard Sam say it's the presidents who are pushing this forward and moving us in this direction. I hear many of my colleagues who are athletics directors say this is not what they want to do. They want to try enhancement. They want to stay together as a group, particularly at a time when we're changing the governing structure of the entire organization. Let's see how that works and move forward. Why is it so important that we do it all right now? Can't we take one small step, see how it goes? These models will be out there. We can look at them in another year or two if we need to. Thanks.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you, Laurie. It would be irresponsible for me to respond at this point. If you have that concern, I think you should bring it in front of the whole group at the subsequent meeting and raise the same issues for discussion.

Mr. Ulrich: With all due respect to Laurie, I applaud Presidents Commission members for having the vision to take on a long-range plan for Division III athletics. I hear we're rushing in too quickly. We're making a rash choice. It seems to me all the presidents are asking us to do is narrow the field from three to two, give them another 365 days to fine tune a proposal that certainly has bugs in all three. We should be looking at the whole situation as creating a long-term plan for Division III.

Mr. Carzo: Thank you. You can rest assured that nothing is etched in stone. It's also capable of being amended. Are there any other questions or concerns?

I compliment you on the very lively discussion. You raised a lot of good questions. We're moving to a meeting where we'll continue this. Thank you very much.

[The discussion session was concluded at 2:51 p.m.]

DISCUSSION SESSION

The Division III discussion session, held in Governors A, was called to order by Michael Walsh, Washington and Lee University, at 1:46 p.m.

Mr. Walsh: This morning, we had an opportunity to hear presentations about enhancements, subgrouping and subdivision. The purpose of this session is to have discussion among the membership regarding those three championships forums. With me this afternoon is John Harvey. John spoke this morning on the enhancement package. Also with us are Jeff Ankrom, who spoke this morning on subdivision, and Mary Jo Gunning, who spoke about subgrouping. Also with us is Dan Dutcher of the NCAA staff and President Jim Appleton, who is in the room as an observer.

I would like to open with any questions that you might have about what we presented this morning. The task force had an opportunity to meet at lunch. We were able to take a look at the many questions that were presented to us. I think

there were well over 100 questions that were turned in after this morning's session.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I would like to know whether we are considering a straw vote or an actual vote. We should be sure that if it is not really a straw vote but an actual vote for or against one of the models, that we know what we're doing. I just have one other question.

Should we consider one of the two model concepts or actual things that will be implemented? If they are concepts, we have an opportunity to have some input to change the way they are. If one of them is voted in, is that what we're stuck with?

Mr. Walsh: It's the impression of the task force that it is a straw vote. It is not a vote that will be cast in concrete. We discussed that at lunch time and I think that is the general consensus of the group. Secondly, the championship models that have been presented are concepts and certainly will be revised and reviewed during the year.

John H. Harvey (Carnegie Mellon University): This is why we set up these sessions. We have at least one president available in each session to convey back not only the sense of the meeting, but some of the particular points, concerns or questions you may have. Whether this is simply a straw vote or if it is something more, Jim might want to respond to that. It is a straw vote and it is seen that way; however, the presidents are going to use that information.

James R. Appleton (University of Redlands): I no longer serve on the Presidents Commission, so I can't speak for them. I would say two things that reinforce what John said. Number one, it is a straw vote. It is not intended to divide the membership. Any legislation that is developed will come back to the full membership before anything is enacted. That's very important.

At the same time, the Presidents Commission, in its conversations through this year, has indicated that it believes the membership wants something beyond enhancements. That's not very clear to us right now. That's why the first question is being asked. The Commission wants direction about which of these two models are most desirable to the present membership. I think I'm being quite accurate about that.

Mr. Harvey: In response to the second part of the question about whether these models are concepts, I think these models were developed over a fairly long period of time with considerable debate within our task force and with considerable research and background. You know what the enhancement model is, but all three of these models are substantially more than concepts. But they all are flexible, too. There is flexibility possible in all of these models as we proceed into the next year.

Jeff and I talked about that briefly. We feel that way. These are models that have been developed over a long period of time. There is considerable research and statistics, as you saw on two of the models this morning. They are more than concepts, but we all realize that flexibility is necessary.

Jeffrey W. Cohen (Brandeis University): I heard in one of the presentations about subdivision that there was some thought about having the two championships play each other. Did I hear that correctly?

Mr. Ankrom: That's never been a part of the subdivision concept. One of the four principles that we put in front of the discussions was the two separate subdivision champions. In the other subgrouping model, there are four champions. I don't think that language is worked out yet, but four subgroup winners would then come together and play for a single championship. The subdivision model would result in two separate champions. There was never any notion that they

would play each other.

Mr. Cohen: I might have misheard that.

I have another question. Did the subdivision folks ever speak with any of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee people or with any student-athletes about their feelings about two championships?

Ms. Gunning: I know that several task-force members are also representing the Council and other various entities on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, so I know that perhaps they may have gathered some sentiments from the student-athletes.

Mr. Walsh: We'll have an opportunity to hear from the student-athletes today. Will we ask them the question? We will ask them the question this afternoon.

Curtis W. Tong (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): I heard John mention the enhancement package as a model. I think there is some confusion in our membership as to whether enhancements represents a model. If the straw vote favors the enhancement route, does that lock us in to the present format forever? Or is enhancement a means of buying time to continue as we have been while we study some other model? I think there is some confusion about exactly what it means.

Mr. Harvey: Yeah, I think Curt is correct. I agree with him. He is good on semantics. I think perhaps the term "model" is incorrect there. The enhancement package is in actuality what we're doing now. We have flexibility. We make changes now and have in the past. We have added spots in the brackets. But it is more than a model, it is an actuality. How much change and how soon that change in what we're doing might occur would simply be a process of legislation. It's more than a model, it's the actuality and can be changed through our normal procedures if we continue with that.

Am I correct in that, Dan?

Daniel T. Dutcher (NCAA Staff): One thing to keep in mind is the comments you heard this morning from President Carter. From a time-frame standpoint, the presidents really want to try to bring this to closure at next year's Convention. So your interpretation of the models—or as John says, the championships-bracket package—from a time-frame standpoint, needs to occur in the context of the fact that the presidents really intend to try to bring this to closure through the consideration of proposed legislation at next year's Convention.

Mr. Appleton: I think the panel hopes to keep the focus primarily on the details of these three pieces as opposed to necessarily what will happen in the general session. In view of that question, it may be useful to know that our vice-president intends for the question to be asked in the following way: "Do you prefer to stay with the present enhancements that have just been enacted or do you prefer to move beyond enhancements to develop legislation on either of these two models?"

I think that's very important to state because that is the first question. Answering "yes" or "no" on that is a direction to the leadership as is the second question that asks which of these are preferred if implemented.

Mr. Ankrom: There was substantial discussion at the task force about this question, Curt. To me, it is a base-line question. What is the base line against which we compare possible change, either subdivision or subgrouping? It's my position that the enhancements represent the base line. I think that's the way the first straw vote question is to be worded. The purpose of those enhancements is to bring our championships up to snuff, so to speak. Earlier in the process, we studied the championships, found they were underfunded and didn't have enough participation opportunity. That's the first thing we did. We put

that in. In my mind, that's the new base line and it is the base line against which change should be compared.

Raymond E. Smith (Hope College): I have a report on two groups that met in the last two weeks. One is the football coaches. When asked what they preferred, they voted 63 to 5 to stay with enhancements and the status quo. The Division III baseball coaches voted unanimously to stay with enhancements and the status quo. I'm not asking a question. I'm just reporting on something the membership may not be aware of. I think we ought to look at that as we consider these three viable options.

Mr. Walsh: The point is that two coaching groups seem to favor the enhancement package. Football is being treated as an exception. I think John Harvey can offer us some insights into the way football will be treated.

Mr. Harvey: My answer here would be appropriate for all three models. Dan Dutcher and I were fortunate enough to meet with Ray's football championships committee a few weeks ago in Salem, Virginia, at the championships and heard its concerns that football in the current system is the one exception to the ratio we have set up. Football, with 16 teams having access, does not currently meet the appropriate ratio of 1 to 8 extending to 1 to 12. We heard that concern and talked about the various questionnaire responses that came back concerning football. All of us agreed that the situation would be addressed regardless of which model is favored. We would like to meet that ratio standard by somehow devising ways to help the football situation toward more access. In talking with Steve Bamford, who is chair of that football committee, we asked the football committee and the football coaches to come up with ways this could be accommodated without extending beyond the four-week term of championships that we now have. Ray, I believe I'm correct in saying that your committee is going to look at possible ways of doing that to propose to the Championships Committee and then eventually to the Management Council and so forth.

Mr. Smith: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: That's the prospect. I think we are all in agreement that needs to be addressed.

Ms. Gunning: In the subgrouping model, an alternative is presented for football. It's an expansion to 24 teams that ends with four subgroup champions to reflect a bowl-type situation. Another alternative, as John alluded to, is to simply remove football from the models and to treat it separately so you can get your ratios.

Mr. Ankrom: I don't want to sound like I'm diminishing the importance of that vote, Ray. That's important information that we need, but there are six other team sports that are affected by this. I think it would be important to get input from all of those. I would assume if we go forward with any changes in the championships, that we would have to look seriously before the final model is put in place about the objections from the different groups, which would come through the Championships Committee. We also need to hear those voices.

John Van Why (Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): The enhancement program increases opportunities. If these are not meaningful opportunities, they are just more numbers in the hat. We heard this morning about the ratio of championships—1 to 7 with the larger schools and 1 to 17 with the smaller schools. Are these opportunities going to change that ratio? The feeling is that it is just more numbers and that the ratio will stay the same.

Why would the schools with larger enrollments not be supportive of two championships? That would definitely change the ratio because you are going to have larger and smaller schools separated and they would still have their champi-

onship opportunities. It is my understanding that of all the fall championships, only one was won by a school with a smaller enrollment. This seems to be magnifying each year. I would like to have you address those two items.

Ms. Gunning: It's basically subdivision, but it also does impact on subgrouping. In the subgrouping model, there has been an attempt to try to group institutions with common program definitions together in the first round of championship play.

I believe that rules out your question in terms of the quality of the experience. In this particular model, the championship format will attempt to be an extension of regular-season play. Going back to our ultimate goal of serving our student-athlete, we'll attempt to provide for championship experiences where a good chance of success would occur more than perhaps it could be argued is occurring at the present time.

Allen F. Ackerman (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh): I want to respond to the last question about the large schools because I am from one. The problem that some of the larger schools is looking at is not so much about whether it is a subgroup or subdivision. What happens during the season when teams in the other subdivisions or the other subgroups will not play? You are really on an island not having in-season competition.

That's one of the concerns some of the larger schools have.

Mr. Van Why: I appreciate your comment and I understand your concern.

I would like to readdress this back to an earlier point. Are these extra opportunities under the enhancement program meaningful opportunities and would they adjust the ratio we heard this morning of 1 to 7 or 1 to 17? They seem to be opportunities, but not meaningful opportunities.

Mr. Harvey: I'm not quite sure what you are after. Do you feel a meaningful experience is more access? Is that what we're saying? Is it legitimately more access or are you questioning whether it's a meaningful experience if it's not based on numbers of increased access? Is that correct?

Mr. Van Why: It means we are just throwing more numbers in the hat but that the same schools will continue to win. The ratio is not going to diminish.

Mr. Harvey: If you are worried about whether you win or whether the same schools continue to win, the enhancement model doesn't change that. Our enhancement model stays with a unified membership with all schools being involved. We were addressing the question of increased access so that perhaps more teams in various sports could get into the championships. As far as whether it's state-supported schools that win or private schools that win, as I see it, there wouldn't be any change in that through what we're talking about. However, there are some changes you've seen in transfer legislation, which we talked about this morning. Other changes are taking place through membership and through transfer restrictions and so forth. We hope that would address some of the concerns that perhaps have led to what some people may perceive as imbalances or inequities.

I would like to respond to Al's comments. It is important to remember that this subdivision is a way to conduct the championships. It's important to keep in mind that we would still retain our common identity. We would still compete against each other in the regular season. That would not be affected. I think it's the championship that we are talking about here.

Mr. Ackerman: I agree with your comment as far as championships. I have been to both types of schools. I have been in a small school. Now I am at a larger school. If you look at how people qualify, losses do make a difference. If we play one of the larger schools and lose, we don't get to go to the other division

or subgrouping championship. They are no longer going to play those types of institutions. I'm not sure you can guarantee that.

Mr. Harvey: I want to get your name to respond further with some information that we have. We have been doing some research on this. Dick Rasmussen, even though he is working with another model, is our in-house mathematician.

He has started with some statistics and research to tell us over a period of years—as a matter of fact, all the way back since championships in their present form started—what the balance was between the top four placements in the eight team sports you are talking about and what the percentages were between the two groupings that had been suggested for subdivision. Those statistics are incomplete. He is still doing the work. That is information we are going to make available to all of our Division III constituents. That will give us facts all the way back as to what the differences in championships success is if that's one of the criteria you're looking at. So far, the statistics show that there is some difference, but much smaller than some people perhaps fear.

Mr. Van Why: I appreciate your comments and I look forward to that survey. I would be interested to see what the differential has been from whenever we started to within the last 10 years and make that comparison.

Mr. Harvey: That's where he is starting. He is going all the way back.

Mr. Van Why: Thank you.

Mr. Smith: Not to belabor the sport of football, but one of the fears of the football coaches is that if we go to subdivisions or subgroupings, we lose the championship game as we know it in Salem, and that really takes on all the amenities of a bowl game. I wonder if the committees have talked about the fact that one of the outstanding perks that football does have, although they don't have access as other sports do at this time, at least they have an unbelievable opportunity if they get to the final two. That game is well run. I think Salem is a model of how it should be done.

Mr. Walsh: Well, thank you. Since I'm part of the conference that helps sponsor the Stag Bowl, we appreciate those kind words.

Ray K. Hammond (Centre College): I'm not sure how many more numbers that Dick Rasmussen is supposed to have, but is this handout what you're talking about?

Mr. Harvey: I think so, it looks like it.

Mr. Hammond: If this is not complete, I can understand that perhaps I shouldn't comment too strongly on it. However, the problem that a number of us are experiencing has not been in existence from the beginning of Division III. It is one that has been in existence the last seven, eight or nine years. The way you can cover up what appears to be a discrepancy or an inequity is to show lots of numbers in which there was not an inequity. That's what this does. It shows lots of numbers when there was not an inequity and it makes the recent inequities seem not to exist, but it really does.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you, Ray. Not everyone in Division III has had an opportunity to have the data that you are referring to. We think it might be best if we don't focus on those numbers right now until everyone has the data.

Richard Coles (Lawrence University): I have a couple of concerns, particularly about the subdivision model that we discussed in our conference meeting. From a recruiting aspect, by calling them III-A and III-AA, there will be a perception that will be encouraged by the A group that it somehow is superior to the AA group. We are in the Midwest Conference, which is Wisconsin, Illinois and Iowa. The Minnesota Conference, which we compete against on the field and in recruiting, has been classified as AA, yet, we are very, very similar insti-

tutions. We are concerned that there might be some inequities in the recruiting aspect, that A will be perceived as being better than AA as it is at the Division I level.

The other concern falls into that same category. In Division I, within facility constraints, they have the option of whether they are I-A or I-AA. The institution chooses. In this model, the institution has no say as to whether they are III-A or III-AA. If the Minnesota Conference doesn't feel comfortable in III-A, it has no option to try to become a III-AA conference. Has there been any provisions or any thought about giving teams the option or some way to allow them to be in one or the other groupings?

Mr. Ankrom: With respect to the name, I would like to point out that at various points in the discussion in the last couple of years, we have actually had different names. We have called them "national," "American." We have even tossed around terms like "red," "blue." Division III-A and III-AA is what we settled on for this model. It has been said before, but it bears repeating again, I think that question about the exact name could be dealt with.

As an anecdote, I am a high-school basketball official. I can assure you that the class IV Ohio champions believe just as strongly as the class III champions that they are state champions. So you can respond to that.

With respect to the self-selection mechanism, we talked about that at lunch. We have talked about it at different times on the task force. I think there will always be a question of how big of a mechanism we'd need for handling situations that are out of the ordinary. Single-sex institutions might be an example. We could probably think of others. For example, where the enrollment disparity between men and women is very large. I think there would have to be a mechanism for handling cases where the institution felt it was truly out of its element or place.

Finally, I would say with respect to subdivision, it is not literally true that everyone is locked in place in the model. Nearly half the institutions under the current set-up are able to change their place by changing their level of sport sponsorship. A higher level of sport sponsorship moves you in one direction and a lower level of sport sponsorship moves you in another direction. I think there is an element of self-selection involved as well.

I appreciate your words about the sensitivity or the perception perhaps of a difference between III-A and III-AA. On behalf of the subgroup, just to reiterate what Jeff has said for his model, they were simply arbitrarily chosen so that we could make a distinction between the subgroups. I am sure that is something we could be more flexible about for future discussion.

Ted Hurwitz (City University of New York Athletic Conference): I am interested in the possibility of still having 64 teams for the men's and women's basketball championship even though it is not exactly the 1-to-8 ratio. We have had it for two years and it has worked wonderfully. I have had a couple of straw polls at the ECAC and here. It is almost unanimous that they would like to see if there is any way, regardless of what the subgroups or the subdivisions are.

It may already be a fait accompli with the enhancements, but I think we should look at football individually. We should also look at basketball in this case. If there is anybody here who backs this up, perhaps we could lobby for it.

In terms of the subdivisions and the subgroupings specifically—I'm more interested in the subgrouping than the subdivision—in my particular subgrouping, there are two teams from California and eight teams from Minnesota. I'm in New York. If we both have equal records, how are we going to decide how to choose the teams that should go to the NCAA? That's in the subdivision and in the sub-

grouping. Mr. Rasmussen said that the grouping in the subdivision would probably be twice the size but nothing has been said about the subgrouping. How will we choose those? In the subdivision and in the subgrouping, I don't come out with even numbers. I'm not in favor of byes for subgrouping. I think that's unfair. That might be something we should address. How many and how do you subdivide them further by region? How would you work it out when two teams from California have the same record as two teams in the east when there is no common opponent? Somebody is going to say they had a tougher league than we do so they should go. I'm totally against that.

Mr. Walsh: Dan Dutcher can answer the question about field size. Perhaps he can also handle the second question. Those were the most frequently asked questions this morning: "How does geography play into the selection process of subgrouping championships?"

Mr. Dutcher: As far as the basketball pool goes, we need to recognize the fact that the size of the basketball bracket and the size of brackets in the other five sports has been reviewed repeatedly by the Championships Committee, the steering committee and the Presidents Council. I would be misleading you if I indicated anything other than I think that it is a "done deal." I think you heard that this morning. I want to emphasize that again. The principle is to treat the ratios—the participant-to-bracket-size ratios—in basketball consistent with those other sports. That's the basis upon which the decision was made. I wouldn't want to mislead you about basketball. I think we need to look beyond that.

Mr. Ankrom: With respect to the question about brackets in sports other than basketball, just doing a crude calculation, if you had a bracket of 16 and another bracket of 32, 16 times eight is 128 and 32 times eight is 256. That's about the size of Division III as it stands now. You really wouldn't necessarily want to have even numbers of institutions in each of the two subdivisions. The same principles pertain to subgroupings. You have nicer brackets if there is a bit of an imbalance.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I need to comment on something Jeff said as it related to determination and as to where you might end up. One of the things that rankles, is this Association has been built on the concept of self-determination. That will no longer be the case if we go to subgrouping or subdivision. That's not the reason I came to the mike. That thought struck me as you said that, Jeff.

It seems to me that the Presidents Commission has perceived a need for change and there are three basic principles that change was built upon: access to championships; membership growth; and commonalities among member schools. Those were the three primary reasons to look at these alternate models for championship enhancement. I think enhancement has to some degree addressed the question of access. The position we took earlier today by extending the provisional membership through the legislative process has also spoken somewhat to the growth issue. I think we have seen a slowdown in that process, not to mention that with our ability to enhance championships, we can accommodate considerably more growth than we currently have.

The third issue—commonality—is perhaps the most difficult to deal with. I have listened to a number of speakers and I'm still not quite clear about what we call the qualitative experience. We sit here speaking for our student-athletes and none of us has taken the time to ask them how they feel about the quality of the experience they just had. Having had a number of teams going to post-season play in a number of different sports and having seen our student-athletes face other student-athletes, tells me the kids feel pretty good about what's hap-

pened win or lose. But we haven't polled them. We have in no way understood what the quality of that experience is except through our own observations. We are making a judgment for them and have never asked them about it. We are ready to jump off and change the model that's been in place for a number of years without being thorough in our approach. I think we need to step back and look at that. Judy said at this point in time the enhancement model looks pretty good. It may not in a year or two or three down the road, but right now it does. I urge our membership not to do anything different than what we are doing now until at least some kind of student-athlete poll has been taken to understand how they feel about the quality of the championship experience. I don't think any of us are really qualified to speak to that. Thank you.

John S. Toll (Washington College, Maryland): Could I ask a very naive question concerning the subgroups? I understand this system allows one to have a national championship. I assume you would like the national championship to be a culmination of the season and therefore a battle between roughly equal partners to make it an exciting contest. But, as I understand the subgroups, you divide them into relatively homogeneous groups. Perhaps I make an unfair analogy, but it is like having a contest in wrestling between the lightweight fighters in one group and the heavyweight fighters in another group. The final championship is then between the winner of the lightweights and the winner of the heavyweights. It doesn't seem to meet the conditions you would like for a national championship. I am probably missing something. I would be eager to understand how one deals with this difficulty under the subgrouping.

Ms. Gunning: It's important to keep in mind that in the subgrouping model, you would have actual subgroup champions prior to going to the final round. It also is important to keep in mind that it is in the first round of championship play that student-athletes are having the opportunity to meet against others from a similar program definition. Therefore, in the first round, it would meet with the philosophy of the subgroup model. It is an attempt to make it an educational experience and also a situation where success can be attained. It's also very important to keep in mind that it doesn't vary that much from our current system. Those teams that are the most competitive will emerge. Thank you.

Sheila K. Wallace Kovalchik (Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I have a couple of observations.

I feel a little bit like someone who has gone into Baskin-Robbins and asked the clerk to list the 31 flavors and then I pick vanilla. I was part of the original group of commissioners who met in Chicago and caused this problem about subdivisions. I've absolutely come full circle. I came away from there being fearful that Division III would become Division III and IV. I never wanted that to happen. I started out the year being a staunch supporter of subdivisions, I have now become a semi-supporter of subgroupings. Today, I have decided to go back to the fence and probably vote toward keeping the enhanced brackets. I think we may have lost sight of the purpose of the national championships—to determine a national champion.

We already have access to that championship. Just win to deserve the right to be there. I agree with Al. I don't think we'll schedule with you if those kinds of results will determine selection because we already have that. We have wonderful national championships. We have equal access and the right to participate. If we want that type of an extension of the season, let's give every team sport one more date for competition, then take the best teams and put them into a national championship.

Kenneth Kutler (Hartwick College): A question about the subgrouping mod-

el. If an institution is a member of a basketball-only conference and that conference is placed in the higher enrollment category, can the members of that conference with lower-enrollment parameters petition to be placed in the lower enrollment category, especially if there aren't any automatic bids for each sport? In other words, would an institution be considered an independent in the other designated sports?

Ms. Gunning: Currently, the way the subgrouping model has been developed, if I'm Institution A and I sponsor eight sports, I would be in one of the four subgroups. If I am in a conference and the majority of my conference members all fit into one particular subgroup, can I then appeal to be removed and go into another subgroup? Is that the question?

Mr. Kutler: That's part of it. The other part is that the conference is a basketball-only conference. The other sports are all independent.

Ms. Gunning: Let me answer the first question. We discussed this over lunch.

With the subgrouping model, which would tie in very closely with this, we could require conferences to have at least eight institutions sponsoring a particular sport.

Secondly – I want to answer carefully to get the right message across, but I also want you to clearly understand where the task force is coming from—it's important that folks are placed and encouraged to go with the subgroup in which the majority of their conference fits into. If we were to get into the waiver process, which is stated in your handout, I think there needs to be some serious thought as to how that would occur. What would be the parameters of that waiver? I certainly wouldn't want to state that the door would be closed on that waiver for going to another subgroup, but it's something that needs to be very carefully considered.

Mr. Kutler: That's why I brought it up. The group might not have thought of single-sport-only conferences.

Ms. Gunning: Yes. And I think that's a good comment and I think it's also something that needs to be considered. Thank you.

Mr. Harvey: I'll tie in something to Ken's comments about sports that are not conference affiliated and pick up on what Sheila said about scheduling. I perceive and I've heard, especially in some of the New England schools, concern about scheduling if we went into subdivision or subgrouping because those groups want to play within their own groups and would not be as easy to schedule outside of their area or group. That was a concern for the 100 independent schools. I think it could be a concern for schools that have traditional rivals who may end up in another group or division. My school currently plays some schools I really like to play. If we went to subdivision, we'd be in another group. I'm not sure they would be willing to play us because they want to build up their power rating within their own group. That has been suggested as a concern. There are achievements to be made through subdivision and subgrouping. But we also have to consider the scheduling, the practicalities of the year-to-year operation that may occur.

Mr. Hurwitz: I'm here to belabor a point. I hear people say: "Well, we are thinking of the student," and some times "the student has to be thought of before the level playing field," and everybody applauds. Even though it is a done deal, and Mr. Rocco Carzo said he would go down fighting, I am still going to try. I think I can get some support for the 64-team field for basketball if we lobby the athletics directors and the commissioners. I've canvassed my conference of nine teams. I've canvassed all of the male and female athletes in basketball. They told me to please go ahead, to fight hard on this, we want inclusion. We shouldn't

just say 1 to 8, I think we should look at it carefully. I don't think that we are doing the right thing for the student when we say it is 1 to 8 and the Presidents Commission and Council say everybody else has done it. We haven't done it. If we have any say on it, I think we should go to the 64 teams. When we talk about enhancements, I feel we have not enhanced, we have declined. We have had two years of 64 teams. I feel wonderful about it. Now I'm going to 48 and I'm enhanced? I would stick with what we have got with 64 teams in basketball and 1 to 8 ratio, which seems to work in other sports. Whatever you want to do with football, I go with.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): As a conference executive director, the biggest battle that I have to face is trying to get some of our conference coaches and schools to focus on the conference as the most important competition. We heard a lot this morning about looking at the Division III philosophy and mission statement and adhering to them. I'm almost certain that I saw in there that conference and regional competition should be the main focus and that access to championships was kind of a gift, an extra. Which one of the models is going to utilize our conference champions as kind of an automatic berth? Who is going to get closer to that? In soccer, a women's team finished third in our conference and was selected by the committee over the first- or the second-place teams because they had played perhaps a better national schedule. That goes against our mission and philosophy.

In a situation where we think perhaps there are some inequities—that I can't compete against this school; because it has perhaps one hand up on us, maybe they are a very large school, perhaps they have lower tuition so they can red-shirt—legislation may take care of them.

The last thing I want to talk about deals with the enhanced model that cuts back to 48 teams in basketball. My understanding is that the 48 would be fully funded.

Mr. Walsh: That's correct.

Mr. Carter: That's the difference. Two instances last year in our conference: We had two teams that ended up playing each other four times in men's basketball. Our top two women's basketball teams ended up going to Virginia to determine who was going to move on to the Final Four. Somehow, we have got to get a better handle on conference and regional competition being more important. Cut down on the need to schedule national powers so that the committee can make a decision on who to send.

Ms. Gunning: I would like to answer part of your question that deals with champions in a conference going forward. I believe it is the subgrouping model that you were referring to. Inherent in the subgrouping model approach is the assumption that it makes it more valuable to have the championship structure provide access to conference champions rather than to select second- or third-place teams. That is closely tied in with part of the philosophy of that subgrouping model.

Secondly, I would like to point out that with any of the models, specifics such as that are determined by sports committees in conjunction with the championship committee. I think that's where it belongs, not necessarily with the task force, but with those individuals who are intimately acquainted with their particular sport and can make the decisions that go back to what we all feel strongly and was stated before—to best serve the needs of our student-athletes.

Mr. Harvey: I want to be sure the route you follow in making these suggestions about championships go through not only the sports committee, but the Championships Committee, and that would be Dan Bridges. You have seen him

today. Dan has been the chair of the Championships Committee and you know some of the members. That's a route to go. Talk to people on the Championships Committee to make sure that they understand. I'm sure they do already, but they need to hear from you that there is concern about your local play and the importance of that and the concerns you expressed about teams traveling too far in the first round and that sort of thing. Those are championships' concern. I think you'll have a very appreciative ear if you talk to the people on that Championships Committee these days about that issue. There has been a long debate over the last six or eight months about improving our championships set-up so that some of those inequities or difficulties don't occur. Go through the Championships Committee first and then ask for the ear of the presidents.

Terry Logue (Westminster College, Missouri): I would like to echo the sentiments of my colleague from New York. I support the 64-team basketball bracket for men and women.

A quick calculation....After this year, according to my calculation, roughly 480 men's and women's basketball players will not have the opportunity to compete in the national tournament under the enhancement model. I wanted to say that because I feel strongly about that.

Mr. Dutcher: You need to consider how many more students will have access to championships because their brackets will be expanded in those other five sports. So that is not a complete equation.

Mr. Logue: I don't think that would bear much weight with the basketball players. My question is this: Why is it so important to have a fully funded championship? Who comes up with the sport-sponsorship ratio of 1 to 8?

Mr. Dutcher: The ratio was developed by various groups starting with the championship subcommittee of the task force. It was then reviewed by the Management Council. It was also approved by the Presidents Commission.

I think the whole decision regarding the fully funded championships bracket model is illustrative of the fact that we are now entering a new governance era in Division III. Policy decisions in all areas, including championships, ultimately are made by the Presidents Council, not by sports committees, the Championships Committee and an Executive Committee dominated by athletics directors. Those decisions are made by CEOs at the Presidents Council level. This is illustrative of that new model. I know it's difficult for folks to come to grips with the fact that major policy decisions such as championships ratios are now being made at that level, but this is illustrative of how that new process is going to work.

Again, the basic principle was that basketball should not be treated differently than other sports in terms of access-to-participant ratios. That was the fundamental basis upon which the decision was made. Thank you.

John O. Galaris (Salem State College): With all due respect to my good friend, Teddy, who beats me on the court regularly, I was one of the architects and was a member of the basketball committee when it got that proposal passed. Some history may be appropriate.

Originally, the basketball committee was going for 48 teams. Because of the way the funding worked at that moment in time, the NCAA would only pay for 40. That created problems so we made a decision to go for 64 teams at that point in time. That was on the men's side of the house. To get that approved, we had to go to the women's side of the house under gender equity and ask them to go with 64. At that moment in time, the women's side of the house was not ready to go to 64. They supported the men. They went from 48 to 64 to support us. We

also polled all of the athletics directors in the country at that time for feedback about funding games. The long and the short of it is that everybody bent to let the basketball championships go to 64. The men were ready for it; the women weren't. We can argue with what the presidents have done, but the truth of the matter is they have enhanced six other championships. We are at 48, which is where we wanted to be as recently as four years ago. Times do change and this issue may come back again. But I would urge you not to fight the presidents on this one because we can't win. They have enhanced six other championships in Division III. I happen to be a basketball person, but I wouldn't argue with that. I have spoken with Bridget about it privately. She asked me why I wouldn't argue with it. I said: "How can I? You have enhanced six championships at the cause of one." By the way, we increased that from 40 to 48 in a very short period of time so we are not too bad off. Thank you.

Mr. Walsh: Thank you, John.

With that, we can adjourn and reconvene in Presidential A as close to 3 p.m. as possible. Thank you.

[The discussion session was concluded at 2:50 p.m.]

Tuesday Morning, January 14, 1997

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 a.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Bridget Belgiovine (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): Good morning and welcome to the second day of our Division III business session for the 1997 Convention.

First, I would like to thank you for your patience yesterday. I regret that the voting machines did not work at our appointed hour. The staff has done its best to correct the problem. We are keeping our fingers crossed that we'll be able to get our votes done first thing and then move on to our additional business.

Thank you for such a good discussion of the championships issues and models. I regret not being able to bring the issue to closure in that we could not fully complete our straw voting. Please note, however, that the principle that we believe in of one institution, one vote still governs this division. That is the essence of what we believe in our federated process. If legislation gets to the 1998 Convention, the membership will decide. In this regard, our first order of business today will be to conduct three straw votes.

In the spirit of yesterday's agenda, we will conduct these votes without further discussion, noting that we have a full record of everything that was talked about during yesterday's sessions, particularly during the breakouts and then the general discussion, and that you had additional time last evening to think about the issues and discuss them with your colleagues.

Our intent, as we indicated yesterday, is to determine the membership's preferences and provide guidance and direction on this issue to our steering committee and our Presidents Commission. Again, we will not announce the result of either of the three votes until all votes are taken, at which time we will then give you the results of each.

Given the speed at which the machine is working, we'll take the first straw vote, let the machine tabulate that and then if the membership approves, start with the paddle vote for the other proposals. We'll complete those, then come back to the second straw vote. That will be tabulated and we'll move forward in that fashion so we can get our business done by noon or earlier.

STRAW VOTE

At this time, we are voting on the first question: "Do you favor the development of a championships model beyond the Division III enhancement package?" "Yes" indicates you want to move beyond enhancements. "No" indicates you are satisfied with enhancements. "Abstain," it's your choice.

I would ask at this point if there's any objection from the membership to begin with the proposals. Does the membership have any objection? Hearing none, we will begin the original agenda for today. After we complete our voting, we will then go back to our second straw vote question and then the third straw vote question. Following that, we will receive updates on governance issues from the members of the governance subcommittee and then we will formally elect the members of our new Division III Management Council.

After that, we'll hear from the members of the task force regarding upcoming membership issues. Finally, we will discuss any topics of interest to the delegates. We're scheduled to adjourn at noon. At this point, we'll hopefully stay on that schedule.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility—Practice Opportunities for Olympians

G. Larry James (Richard Stockton College of New Jersey): I move adoption of Proposal 95 on behalf of the NCAA Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal originated from a joint task force of the U.S. Olympic Committee and the NCAA, cochaired by Ced Dempsey and George Steinbrenner.

The proposal extends a new practice opportunity for potential Olympians that was established at last year's Convention. Currently, a former student-athlete or a student-athlete who is not enrolled on a full-time basis is permitted in certain sports to participate in practice activities at the institution that the student-athlete previously attended as an undergraduate subject to certain conditions. Proposal 95 would allow such practice opportunity for a former student-athlete at any institution the individual currently attends or previously attended as a graduate student. The Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believe that this proposal represents a goodwill gesture to the Olympic movement and the USOC without increasing the potential for abuse. I urge your adoption of this legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-165) was adopted.]

Eligibility—Hardship Waiver

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 142.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is the first in a series of proposals that the Legislative Review Committee recommended to the Council for deregulation. Four of these proposals will be brought up for your consideration this morning.

In sports that are subject to date-of-competition limits, such as track and field and golf, there exists some confusion as to whether the percentage calculation for purposes of meeting the hardship waiver should be based on completed dates of competition. Under current NCAA legislation, the phrase "completed events" refers to completed varsity contests in all sports. Thus, in sports subject to date-of-competition limitations, a student-athlete who participates in three contests

on a single date uses one date of competition for purposes of Bylaw 17, but has participated in three completed events for purposes of applying the hardship waiver in Bylaw 14.

Adoption of this proposal would permit the percentage calculation for hardship waivers in those sports that use dates of competition to be based on the institution's number of completed dates of competition as opposed to completed varsity events. The hardship waiver calculation in Bylaw 14 would now be consistent with how dates of competition are calculated in Bylaw 17. We respectfully urge your support.

[Proposal No. 142 (Page A-224) was adopted.]

De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

Lynda J. Calkins (Hollins College): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 98, Sections A, B, C, E, F, G and J.

[The motion was seconded.]

At last year's Convention, the membership adopted legislation that eliminated the responsibility of each institution to declare a student-athlete or a prospect ineligible for small, inconsequential types of violations. These types of violations do not result in a benefit being provided to the prospect or the student-athlete, and the institution seldom gains a recruiting or competitive advantage. It is important to note, however, that all violations of NCAA rules, including those in this proposal, must be reported to the NCAA enforcement staff.

One or more of the penalties outlined by Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed upon the institution and the institutional employees. The only difference is that the eligibility of innocent prospects or the student-athlete will not be affected. The Eligibility Committee believes that this proposal is an effective and positive step toward deregulation of de minimis violations that currently affect a prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility. The Eligibility Committee strongly supports this proposal. I urge your support as well.

Ms. Belgiovine: Lynda, excuse me. Did you intend to include "D" as well? Okay. That was omitted from your initial statement. Any further discussion?

[Parts A, B, C, D, E, F, G and J of Proposal No. 98 (Page A-169) were adopted.]

Visit Unrelated to Recruitment—National Student-Athlete Day

Mary Jo Gunning (Marywood College): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Minority Opportunity and Interests Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to exempt National Student-Athlete Day activities held on an institution's campus from the limitations on providing entertainment to a prospect.

National Student-Athlete Day is a significant event recognizing and bringing together athletes of all abilities, inclusive of prospects and collegiate student-athletes.

This proposal demonstrates the administration's and Association's commitment to encouraging athletics participation and facilitates the promotion of issues related to student-athlete welfare. Prospective student-athletes should have an opportunity to participate in collegiate National Student-Athlete Day activities within their own communities. Their participation should be exempt from counting as an official visit. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 113 (Page A-190) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Camps and Clinics

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 144.

[The motion was seconded.]

The general principle of Bylaw 17 regarding the number of student-athletes who may be employed in an institution's camp or clinic is no longer necessary inasmuch as in all sports other than Division I football, it is now permissible for an institution to employ student-athletes in its camps or clinics.

The committee notes that it remains impermissible for student-athletes to engage in organized practice activities under the guise of an institution's camp or clinic. This proposal merely deletes a principle that is no longer applicable. In the spirit of deregulation, we respectfully urge your support.

[Proposal No. 144 (Page A-227) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Annual Exemptions—Baseball, Field Hockey, Ice Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer and Softball

Richard A. Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 122-C.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council notes that this proposal would permit ice hockey to participate annually in one season-ending championship without including such competition in the institution's maximum contest limitation.

This opportunity already exists in other Division III team sports. Last year, we adopted Proposal No. 73, which established this exception in baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer and softball. The Council believes such an exception makes sense in ice hockey as well. I urge your adoption of this proposal.

[Part C of Proposal No. 122 (Page A-199) was adopted.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Wrestling—Division III

Joe Thompson (Luther College): On behalf of the Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I would like to move Proposal 127.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit 16 dates of competition in wrestling, with not more than two, two-day meets counted as a single date of competition.

This proposal is consistent with legislation governing Divisions I and II. More importantly, it provides legislation that's consistent with the rules governing the majority of sports in Division III. The NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission support this legislation. We also urge that you support this proposal.

Kevin A. McHugh (College of New Jersey): As chair of the NCAA Wrestling Committee, I, too, ask the delegates to support Proposal 127.

The intent of this amendment actually means no more than really providing the same competitive opportunities available in Divisions I and II. This past year, the Wrestling Rules Committee implemented several measures aimed at curbing unsafe weight-loss practices in the sport across all three divisions. Without getting into all the specific details, most of these measures relate to the number of scheduled contests and their connected weigh-ins. However, at present, with Division III counting tournaments differently than Divisions I and II, applying the weight-loss measures uniformly for all three divisions is extremely difficult and confusing.

To redress the current inequity and to allow the weight-loss measures maximum effectiveness, I again ask for your support for this amendment. Thank you.

David L. Beckley (Rust College): The Division III members of the Presidents Commission support this proposal. It will provide a greater competitive opportunity for wrestling to student-athletes without extending the length of the playing season or reducing the time needed to pursue their academic interests. We, therefore, urge your support of this proposal.

John S. Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to speak in support for adoption of Proposal No. 127.

The Council believes that this proposal would not significantly increase the number of dates of competition and will not interfere with students' academic interests since multiple-team wrestling meets typically take place on weekends. Further, this proposal would allow wrestling to have two multiple-day meets at one date of competition, similar to the way contests are counted in other sports. Therefore, I urge your support for adoption of Proposal No. 127.

[Proposal No. 127 (Page A-208) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Division III—Contest/Date of Competition Exemptions

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 148.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation prohibits a Division III institution from accepting contests on a foreign tour during the same four-year period that the institution competed in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico.

The Council and committee believe that this prohibition is overly restrictive as it applies to Division III student-athletes. In addition, as a practical matter, Division III institutions do not normally engage in a foreign tour and a trip to Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico in the same four-year period. As a result, the current legislation appears to be unnecessary. We respectfully urge your support of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 148 (Page A-234) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Outside Competition—Basketball

Mr. Jacobs: On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

The committee recognizes the amount of paperwork with which the membership is faced and sees this piece of legislation as an opportunity to decrease that amount. Adoption of this proposal would eliminate the requirement that the NCAA Council must approve participation of sanctioned outside-team tours in the sport of basketball. Such tours would be sanctioned only on an institutional basis in accordance with Bylaw 30.7, and only if more than two of an institution's basketball student-athletes participate. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 149 (Page A-235) was adopted.]

STRAW VOTE

Ms. Belgiovine: At this point, we are prepared to take the second question, if there is no opposition from the membership. Let us take the second straw vote. Regardless of your response on Question No. 1, please provide your preference of the two models. Let me go back and clarify something that was asked yesterday. There was a question regarding the clarification of an abstention. Under NCAA procedures, an abstention is actually not a vote. An abstention is

that. The number not voting was significantly higher. We want to make sure that we have an accurate count. An abstention means you do not choose to vote, but you are here. So if there are no objections, we will request that we revote the first straw vote.

Dennis M. Collins (North Coast Athletic Conference): Bridget, it may be the fact that some people have left the Convention. I know last night I heard that a number of people were leaving.

Ms. Belgiovine: A comparison of the two straw votes, and the number of complete votes in the second one was 264. The number of completed, tracked votes in the first one was 220. So the individuals with the voting units, based on the second vote, indicate that the members are here. If you're having difficulty with your voting unit, you need to bring it over to the computer table. Question No. 1: "Do you favor the development of a championship model beyond the Division III championships enhancement package?" Yes, no or abstain. Please cast your vote, lock it in. The polls are now closed.

Since we have not technically concluded all of the legislation, we will not close that opportunity. However, we will move forward in our program. We're now ready to receive an update regarding the progress of some important governance issues in Division III. To make this report will be three members of the restructuring task force: John Biddiscombe, director of athletics, Wesleyan University; Stan Caine, president of Adrian College; and Jen Shillingford, director of athletics at Bryn Mawr College. John will begin.

REPORTS

John S. Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Good morning. Thank you, Bridget. Before I start with some general comments about the work of the governance subcommittee, I would like to mention that there were two other members who participated in this discussion. Those people are Judy Sweet from the University of California at San Diego, and John Harvey, the athletics director at Carnegie Mellon University, who served very well as chair of this committee.

This morning, we would like to present a summary of the work of the governance subcommittee during 1996 that we believe will facilitate the implementation of the new Division III governance structure. Prior to the Convention, the task force forwarded a mailing to the membership regarding the status of the Division III governance and membership initiatives. Copies of this report are available near the dais. Please feel free to pick up a copy at the end of this session.

We do not intend to go over all the specific information included in this report. Rather, we would like to focus our discussion today on the Division III committee appointment process. We would, however, be happy to answer any questions you may have at the end of our presentation today. Before we begin the report on the committee appointment process, however, on behalf of the committee, I would like to take a minute to thank you, the membership, for your support in the adoption of Proposal 28-P related to the new Division III organizational structure during yesterday's voting session. Without your support, this new structure would not have been created. We are confident that Division III governance will be enhanced by this new organizational structure. The current Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission will become the new Division III Presidents Council in August of 1997, which is the effective date of the NCAA restructuring legislation.

At that time, President David Carter will complete his term as chair of the

subcommittee. It was through his thorough leadership that we were able to create what we believe will be a better and more efficient Division III governance process. On behalf of the governance subcommittee, we would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for his guidance and dedication to the future success of our division. President Carter will be succeeded by President Curt McCray of Millikin University. We know Curt to be a dedicated and committed member of the current Commission. We look forward to his leadership in the new structure.

It is now my pleasure to introduce to you and turn this presentation over to my colleague, President Stan Caine. Stan.

Stanley P. Caine (Adrian College): Let me comment briefly on the Division III committee appointment process and several of the key committees that exist under the new structure. The new Division III Management Council, Budget Committee, Championships Committee and Nominating Committee will have responsibilities to discharge in a transitional capacity at the close of this Convention.

Therefore, nominations for these committees were solicited in early November. The nomination process was completed by mid-December. The individuals appointed to serve on these committees were selected by the Division III leadership, comprised of the chairs of the Division III Steering Committee, the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission and the Division III Restructuring Task Force. New members of these committees have been identified in the pre-Convention issue of *The NCAA News*.

You should also have received a handout listing their names and institution or conference affiliation. We would like to extend our congratulations to the new members of these committees for agreeing to commit their time and energy to serve the Division III membership during a very critical time in our history.

As you know, the present Division III Steering Committee will evolve into the new Division III Management Council, with the addition of eight seats when the structure takes effect this next August. To provide continuity into the new structure, 11 of the 19 members of the Management Council are presently serving on the steering committee or the Division III task force. In choosing the Management Council members, certain guidelines were adhered to. No conference was permitted to have more than one representative, and selected new appointments were made for less than a full four-year term in order to stagger the future turnover on the Management Council and to provide continuity into the new structure.

The eight-member Division III Budget Committee will be responsible for handling all Division III budgetary issues and will consider the budgetary ramifications of all proposals forwarded to it by the Management Council. The Budget Committee will report directly to the Management Council and ultimately to the Division III Presidents Council regarding all budgetary considerations. A new budget and meeting schedule will accompany the implementation of the new governance structure, which features earlier budgetary deadlines for all NCAA committees as well as the ultimate control by chief executive officers of the Association's budgetary process. This schedule is included in the governance document. Copies of that are available near the dais.

The new Championships Committee is an expansion of the existing Division III Championships Committee. The present five-member committee has been expanded to nine members, including one student-athlete representative. Please note that appointments to this committee are contingent on the approval of non-

controversial legislation to revise the requirements of new Bylaw 21.10.6.2.1 to one representative per region as opposed to one representative per district. The Council will consider this issue during its post-Convention Council meeting. The need for this revision is due to the limited number of Division III members in certain districts, which creates a problem in appointing members to this committee. We would like also to point out one change related to the reporting line of this committee. Under the revised Division III governance structure, the Championships Committee initially will forward all of its recommendations, including budgetary recommendations, to the Management Council and ultimately to the Presidents Council.

This is a significant change from the current governance structure, which allows the Championships Committee to report directly to the NCAA Executive Committee.

Jen Shillingford will now comment on the all-important nominating process.

Jenepher P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): Thanks very much, Stan.

Permit me to make an editorial comment. We have spent, at your request, a significant amount of time on championships. Yet, I feel very strongly that the governance of this organization, its structure and what we do with membership are going to be very, very vital in the future. So it was really my pleasure to serve on the governance committee. I felt this was a very significant group.

Let me talk a little bit about the Nominating Committee because it is a committee that is now going to have broadened responsibility. It is a committee that is going to try to involve more institutional and conference involvement so that we broaden the number of people who are involved.

The new Nominating Committee is listed on your handout. It's composed of four Division III representatives in the existing committee and four new members, and I think this marks a significant innovation in the Division III governance structure. This committee will coordinate nominations for the Management Council, all standing committees that report to the Management Council and the sports committees. The first task will be to coordinate the nomination and selection process for the remainder of the Division III standing committees that will exist in that structure. Let me list those committees: Eligibility and Infractions, Financial Aid and Awards Committee, Interpretations and Legislation Committee — that's a combined committee — Membership Committee, and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

You have received some of those changes because one of the charges of the governance committee was to combine some of those committees, or if they were committees that related to Divisions I and II issues, to eliminate them. Nominations will be sought soon after this Convention. The appointment process will be completed following the April transitional meeting of the new Division III Management Council with final approval of the Presidents Council in June.

The Nominating Committee also will coordinate the nomination process for sports committees on behalf of the Championships Committee, the Management Council and the Presidents Council. Again, it is anticipated that nominations will be solicited following this Convention and that the process will be completed in April and approved by the presidents in June.

It should be noted that during its December meeting, the Division III Championships Committee confirmed that it will be necessary to replace those sports committee members whose terms are scheduled to expire in 1997.

Four principles were developed to provide the Nominating Committee with guidance for future committee appointments. I'd like to tell you about those principles.

This is the first principle: Representatives on committees in the Association's current structure should be invited to fill vacancies for the amount of the remaining time of their service, provided the committee is continuing with the same topic area and scope. The second principle: Significant committee experience is preferred for service on the Management Council. The third principle: Some committee experience is preferred for service on the Budget, Nominating and Championships Committee. Finally, the fourth principle: No Management Council member should serve as a Council representative on more than one Division III committee with the exception of the chair and vice-chair, as required by legislation. I think that's a very interesting one. I do remember in the days of serving on the Council that there were many, many committee appointments. It seems to make a great deal more sense to the Nominating Committee to spread that load.

These principles and additional legislative requirements were applied to the nomination process for the Management Council and Budget, Championships and Nominating Committees. We'll soon vote upon the ones that you are holding in your hand. The following numbers, and I think this is significant, were tabulated to compare the number of new members selected to serve on these four committees with the number of nominations received in the national office.

First, the Management Council. There were 30 nominations received and seven individuals were selected to serve on that Council. Second, the Budget Committee. Out of 15 nominations received, two individuals were selected to serve on the Budget Committee. For the Championships Committee, the national office received 32 nominations and five individuals were selected to serve on the Championships Committee. Finally, for the Nominating Committee, 30 nominations were received and seven individuals were selected to serve on that committee. Interestingly enough, with regard to conference affiliation, 11 new conferences will be represented by individuals serving on those four committees. We'd like to point out that while we received a sufficient number of nominations to fill the positions on these committees, our division must be willing to make a more conscious effort to participate in the nomination process. We received a very low number of nominations from some conferences and from some independent institutions. There were a number of nominations that were received after the deadline. So you do need to watch *The NCAA News*, both when we are soliciting individuals and what the deadlines are.

For this reason, the Nominating Committee will be taking a very active and aggressive role in soliciting nominations in the new governance structure. Two things that may assist in this process are the use of the Division III web site on the World Wide Web and also the use of a list service, so that we may be utilizing some alternative methods to soliciting and gathering nominations. We do invite you to submit nominations to fill positions on the remainder of the Division III committees that will exist in the new structure. We would also like to remind you that this invitation includes self-nominations.

The new system cannot succeed without your help and support. We will need nominations from all conferences and independents and from all constituencies, including chief executive officers, athletics directors, senior women administrators, faculty athletics representatives and coaches.

I thank you. That concludes our report. If there are questions, I'll be happy to pass them on.

Ted Hurwitz (City University of New York Athletic Conference): Listening to your criteria and seeing these wonderful people, I do see quite a bit of repeat people on the committees. I don't think you addressed that as being used as one

of the criteria.

I see seven people repeated from the Management Council to the Budget and Championships Committee. I'm interested in the answer to that.

Ms. Belgiovine: Our legislation requires that members of the Management Council serve on committees that report to the Management Council. That's why you see overlap. It's a liaison capacity.

Thank you, John, Stan and Jen. Congratulations to those individuals who have been selected to serve as we move into our new structure.

I'd like to echo a couple of points that you just heard related to the committee-appointment process. Filling the committee vacancies on a small scale, let alone a large scale, is one of the more difficult exercises you would ever want to engage in. While I believe strongly in the principles that we've outlined and believe strongly that that will engage more of our members in our governance process, it still makes that process difficult, particularly when we start out. We had to pass over many qualified nominees. Often, we could not appoint these individuals to their desired committee either because their conference already had a member on that committee or they did not meet the necessary legislative criteria for one of the openings on the committee. Many times, there simply weren't enough openings available for the qualified individuals.

To those of you in the room who were not selected, I'd like to emphasize that there will be a second round of nominations for the remaining committees that Jen identified. Please consider your name for those. If you are interested, contact myself, Dan Dutcher or Marybeth Ruskamp. We have all your data. You would simply need to tell us if you're interested in either the Membership Committee, the Interpretations Committee, the Eligibility Committee or the Financial Aid and Awards Committee. We will work to include people in the process.

To those of you who were not involved in that first process, I strongly urge and encourage you to now consider getting involved. You will shortly be reading in *The NCAA News* the call for additional nominations. That is your opportunity to put your name forward. Given the process that we've developed for a database, we now will keep people on file. If an appointment or an opening were to arise, we could contact you to ask if you are still interested, assuming you have not moved or changed positions. You'll get a confirmation without being required to fill out another data form. That is a distinct difference and a very positive change for the nomination process. There are also openings on sports committees that you will have the opportunity to serve.

I would like to thank ahead of time the Nominating Committee. It has a rather large task ahead of it in the next two months because that slate needs to be submitted to the steering committee at our April meeting. So all of this will occur prior to our April steering committee meeting. Your involvement is critical and we've laid out the legislation that allows us to involve more people in our governance structure.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Ms. Belgiovine: It's time formally to appoint members to the new Management Council. Under our governance legislation, this appointment occurs through a vote of the membership, similar to the way the members of the Division III Steering Committee were appointed in the past.

[Note: The slate for Division III representatives to the Management Council was unanimously approved as presented.]

STRAW VOTE

Ms. Belgiovine: At this time, it will be in order to take the third straw vote. For this particular vote, I would like to note to the membership that the only way on this vote to abstain would be to not vote. Since all three buttons will be used to cast a vote, if you choose not to or you choose to abstain on all three, then you simply would not vote.

Question No. 3: "Which championships model do you prefer?" "Yes" indicates enhancements. "No" would indicate subdivision. "Abstain" would indicate subgrouping. Please cast your vote. Be sure to lock it in. The polls are now closed.

That concludes our consideration of the proposed legislation for the Division III business sessions at this Convention. Before we leave the legislation, I'd like to make a special announcement. First of all, I would like to personally thank each of our delegates for their patience in this process. Please note that our goal was to make sure that your voices were heard and that we have as accurate information as we possibly can.

As you know, Joe O'Rourke, to my far left, your right, has served as Division III parliamentarian for the last three years. His service to us in that capacity has been first-rate. We actually made him work very hard at this Convention. He has always been well prepared and quick to identify the right answer to a vexing question. You have no idea how much his presence has contributed to our comfort, particularly my comfort level on the dais. For some strange reason, Joe has decided that the joys of retirement should be more appealing than the thrills of mootnicity and making legislative decisions. This will be his last year as our parliamentarian. Joe, thank you for your great help and assistance in our parliamentary procedures. (Applause) He is truly off to a better life, as we are off to creating our future.

REPORT

Ms. Belgiovine: Our next topic will be the report of the subcommittee on membership from the Division III task force. Lynda Calkins, director of athletics from Hollins College; Walter Johnson, director of athletics at North Central College; and Mike Walsh, director of athletics at Washington and Lee University; will give the report. We hope as this report is given and concludes, that there will be some feedback regarding this very important issue that faces our membership. First up, Walter Johnson.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): Thank you, Bridget. We want to take this time to present a summary of our work during 1996 and identify some key membership issues that may come before the membership in 1997.

Prior to this Convention, the task force forwarded a mailing to you regarding the status of Division III governance and membership initiatives. Our report today will reiterate some of the information you received in the mailing related to membership initiatives and will give you an opportunity to discuss any issues related to this material.

Throughout the past year, the membership subcommittee, chaired by Dick Rasmussen, attempted to address the needs of our membership not only in relation to restructuring and transition issues, but also by attempting to anticipate and identify future membership needs for our division. In this regard, the task force, steering committee and Presidents Commission agreed to sponsor Proposals No. 54 and 55 at this year's Convention. These proposals were adopted by Division III during yesterday's legislative voting session. We would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for your support in the adoption of these proposals. We believe these proposals will be instrumental in assur-

ing that our membership supports the principles of a broad-based athletics program and that our new members will be prepared to be full members of Division III.

As we began our review of membership issues, it became apparent that our division was in need of a Membership Committee that could focus solely on Division III membership issues. We believe the creation of this committee is essential to the future success of our division. The new Membership Committee will be composed of nine members and will review issues related to Division III membership requirements. Its charge will include the review of a number of issues such as provisional membership, the provisional membership process, the reclassification of members from other divisions, waivers of membership criteria and the coordination of future educational efforts for both provisional and continuing members. The nomination process for the Membership Committee will begin soon after the Convention. The committee should be functioning this spring following the April Management Council meeting.

At this time, I'd like to ask Lynda Calkins to come forward and give you some of the details.

Lynda J. Calkins (Hollins College): Thank you, Walter. We've also identified a number of specific initiatives that we will forward to the Membership Committee for review. These initiatives include an enhanced review process for provisional members and an enhanced institutional self-study guide.

The review of provisional members should be enhanced through the request of institutional documentation and information related to specific areas of concern to Division III. Much of the additional documentation requested will coincide with the current Division III institutional self-study guide. This documentation may include such things as a copy of the institutional written statement of philosophy, the institutional catalog or financial aid brochure listing all financial aid awards offered by the institution, information related to the number of students versus student-athletes who receive need-based financial aid, and the institution's written policy related to the recruitment of student-athletes.

Possible revisions and additions to the institutional self-study guide include a recommendation from the NCAA committee on competitive safeguards related to the equitable access to sports equipment and sports medicine for male and female student-athletes and increased emergency medical care for practice and competition. We believe both of these incentives will assist institutions in determining their compliance with Division III legislation and their commitment and adherence to the Division III philosophy regarding intercollegiate athletics.

We also will ask the new Membership Committee to consider strengthening the current membership legislation related to divisional movement in the first and second educational year of the provisional membership period. Institutions are not required to be in full compliance with a particular division's legislation until the last two years of the provisional membership period. Therefore, it makes sense that an institution should be given the opportunity to use that year to determine which division would best suit its needs.

We will ask the committee to consider expanding the current minimum two-year reclassification period to Division III to a period of possibly three years. In addition, we will ask the Membership Committee to consider prohibiting Division I and II institutions from continuing to provide athletics aid to student-athletes once the institution has entered the reclassification period to become a Division III member.

We will also ask the Membership Committee to review the possibility of conducting educational sessions at future NCAA Conventions. We believe that future

Conventions will place more emphasis on discussion sessions and educational programs. The sessions could be made mandatory for provisional members and would include topics such as Division III financial aid and recruiting legislation. We believe these discussion sessions and educational programs will help support our division's commitment to upholding the legislation and philosophy of Division III.

I'm going to ask Mike Walsh to continue in this vein.

Michael F. Walsh (Washington and Lee University): Thank you, Lynda. The Membership Committee also will have the responsibility of reviewing waiver requests from institutions that do not meet the division's membership requirements, including the increased sports-sponsorship requirements from four men's and four women's sports to five sports for each gender, and the increase in team-sports sponsorship requirements from two men's and two women's team sports to three team sports for each gender.

Finally, we will forward a request to the Membership Committee to review the possibility of establishing some type of educational assessment for Division III coaches related to all Division III legislation. We envision that coaches' participation in such educational programs would be on a voluntary basis. As you may be aware, the NAIA has recently liberalized its bylaws to permit colleges with dual affiliation with other athletics organizations such as the NCAA to play sports under the NAIA umbrella without subjecting them to NAIA rules. This new rule would apply to sports that are not affiliated with the NAIA. The NAIA believes that a liberalization of its rules will deter the increased drop in enrollment it has experienced over the past few years.

The membership subcommittee reviewed the issue and noted that this liberalization of the NAIA rule did not appear to directly affect our membership. Rather, it may provide a positive step in the relationship between the NAIA and the NCAA. This issue needs to be studied more carefully.

Finally, we would like to comment on the status of the membership moratorium. As you may know, the moratorium was established by the NCAA Council in August 1995 to stabilize the Association's membership during the restructuring process and the transition to the new governance structure.

The moratorium was scheduled to last at least through the implementation of the new structure. During the pre-convention meetings, the NCAA Council and Commission reviewed a recommendation from the NCAA Transition Oversight Committee regarding the date that the moratorium will be lifted. The Council agreed with the committee's recommendation that new members may begin to submit application for NCAA membership no earlier than the conclusion of the January 1998 Convention. This will permit each division to fully implement its new structure and consider legislation through its new legislative process before the moratorium is lifted. Thus, the earliest class of new provisional members would be in the fall of 1998.

In conclusion, we would like to say that it has been an honor to serve on the task force and its membership subcommittee. This is a very exciting time for our division. We have an opportunity for a new beginning and the ability to focus on issues that are specific to Division III.

As we move forward with the membership initiatives that we have mentioned today, we hope that each of you will become involved in some way in our governance process and will be able to realize the benefits that restructuring will bring to our membership.

We would be happy to answer any questions that you may have at this time. Our committee was chaired by Dick Rasmussen, so he might be able to help as

well. Thank you.

STRAW VOTE RESULTS

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, Lynda, Walter and Mike. These issues are important to our future. We do encourage you to continue to talk about them. I think one of the real positive innovations of our new structure will be the fact that we will have a Division III specific Membership Committee, as all three members alluded to.

These issues, we know, have not received the attention that they deserve. We heard that yesterday from some of our current provisional members and those who have just recently moved into the division. I encourage you to provide your comments to the new committee so that it can fully exercise and work toward the betterment of the membership issues.

If there are no further comments on that particular issue, then I'd like to give you the results. The vote on Question No. 1: "Does the membership wish to move beyond enhancements?" Yes 113, no 173, abstentions four. The second question: "If we move beyond, which two models does the membership favor?" Subdivision 95, subgrouping 131, abstentions 38. The third question: "Which model would you prefer with all three options on the table? Enhancement 173, subdivision 64, subgrouping 37 and not voting 108. There are only a total of 290 voting, so there were 16 in the session not voting. So let me review the numbers. Enhancements 173, subdivision 64, subgrouping 37 and not voting 16 out of 290.

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Belgiovine: At this time, given our schedule, it would be appropriate to, if the membership wishes, open the floor for further discussion on any of the issues that we have addressed. We do have the opportunity to further discuss issues that have been on the floor for the last two days. Again, this is your opportunity to express your particular opinion or that of your conference, which would only be viewed to assist in the work of the steering committee and the Presidents Commission.

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): My name is Bill Gates from Microsoft. I'd like to offer a new computer system.

In waiting for the votes relative to enhancements, subgrouping and subdividing, I was pleased to see the enhancement model being the vote of choice. Although when I look at enhancement, I'd like to speak to two sports that are two of the three most popular sports on our campus—men's and women's basketball. When we look at enhancement relative to men's and women's basketball, the enhancement term is an interpretation.

Yes, we will be going to 48 fully funded fields for both of those entities; however, we will be reducing from 64 to a total of 48. We have seen in men's and women's basketball the popularity of this venture in terms of publicity, in terms of student support. However, with that reduction to 48, access will be limited, and that has been a key topic of concern.

We did have 17 institutions participate in the Division III tournament that never had the opportunity before to do so. We will also see a reduction in automatic-qualifier status for conferences. Many conferences came about and were driven by the potential for playing in men's and women's basketball tournaments.

For the Council and for the Championships Committee, I think that this is an issue that they need to be concerned with. If we stay with the strictly 1-to-8 ratio, all we're eating is vanilla ice cream. I think that the diverse participation seen in men's and women's basketball and volleyball, with over 90 percent of our insti-

tutions represented, deserves a different look. Thank you.

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, Jim. Recall that we dealt with the principle, which affects the entire division, so some sports will be affected in different ways.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Referencing Items No. 72 and 136, both of which were passed by this assembly, both of which deal with transfer things, in the spirit of deregulation, is there any way that the Interpretations Committee, Council or some appropriate committee could work those two things into the same item so that we deregulate instead of having two different pieces that deal with transfer?

Ms. Belgiovine: Bill, we'll take that information to our post-Convention steering committee meeting and address it.

Anthony J. DeCarlo (John Carroll University): I would like to compliment everyone for all their work.

In coming up with a set of numbers, I wonder how many out of the 173 are people who maybe had an easy time making the decision who might not have the sport of football.

I heard a report yesterday by our chairman. I talked to both our chair here and the chair of the football committee. We talk about access. We have students stand up and say what a great opportunity it is to have access and improvement in access to championships, but I'm concerned that we haven't done anything recently for football.

Football, with over 200 teams and every team averaging from 50, 60 to 120 members, we have 15 to 20,000 athletes who are not necessarily being considered as far as this is concerned.

I appreciate that the committee will look at this. I just would appeal to this organization to consider the possibility — even though subdivision was the only one that gave more opportunity—of some sort of formula for the sport of football.

Years ago at this particular Convention when the scrimmage was eliminated, the word at the Convention was that in the next year or two the scrimmage would be reinstated. Well, it was like pulling teeth trying to get that scrimmage back, something that was desperately needed. I would hope that we could consider some sort of access for this particular sport. There are a lot of people involved.

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, Tony.

Stephen R. Bamford (Plymouth State College): Thank you, Bridget. I'm the chair of the NCAA football committee.

In response to Tony's question about bracket expansion within the sport of football, I can assure you at our meeting next month in Kansas City that that will be a main priority item on our agenda of the committee and certainly within the next 12 months. Before next year's Convention, we will work diligently to come up with some options in the enhancement proposal to offer bracket expansion in the sport of football so we can have the same kind of student-athlete access to championships that are provided for the other seven sports.

I urge the membership, if you have some solutions or some suggestions in terms of bracket expansion within the enhancement model, please forward them to me. I would love to present them at the meeting in Kansas City next month. We would certainly encourage everyone who has a concern with regard to this football issue to indicate that to us as well. Thank you very much.

Robert G. Bierie (Loras College): Let me try to address the issue, at least to get people thinking on the football issue. Division III, public, eight teams in their own bracket. Division III, private, 16 teams in their own bracket. Play it out. You would have two national champions, a public and a private.

John M. Schael (Washington University, Missouri): Before I leave, I just want to congratulate the task force committee for all the hard work it did presenting the models to us today.

I just feel really great in terms of when we leave Nashville that we are unified as one in Division III. We're not split based on championships.

I think the vote on the enhancements was very positive. That will provide some good direction to those who will study the issue down the road. In particular, it benefits the student-athletes with the increased opportunities that are available to them.

Thanks a lot for all your hard work. The Management Council, once again, is a real plus for Division III. We can be a partnership and work together and even have more enhancements than we have right now when we come back in 1998. Thank you.

Jack Swartz (College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin): We just passed Resolution 141. I would just ask the steering committee to add women's golf and women's tennis to that list because it's a nontraditional season for us. We play it in the fall. Thank you.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): I would just ask that the Championships Committee, as we work forward on this issue of championship access, consider the great opportunities for student-athletes to earn their way into the championship by playing the contests that they're involved in as opposed to a political selection process, which eliminates certain athletes from the enhancement of opportunity. Thank you.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): I'd just like to take this opportunity to thank the chair and the task force and all the groups that have been involved in this very difficult process. I know you've taken some barbs along the way. So on behalf of the membership, I'd like to thank everyone.

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, John. (Applause) I certainly appreciate the fact that we could get through this. The discussion needed to happen. We need to leave here and continue to talk about it. You need to know that the steering committee and the Presidents Commission will work to make sure that Division III maintains its level and its principles and continues to move forward in the best interests of our student-athletes.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.]

■ Division I Business Session

Monday Morning, January 13, 1997

The Division I business session was called to order at 11 a.m., with Division I Vice-President Robert Sweazy, Texas Tech University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Sweazy: We are ready to begin the session. The NCAA SWAT team will be here in a couple of minutes, so I would advise you to please take your seats.

Our primary task today, between now and 3:45, is to complete the Presidential Agenda Day portion of the agenda for the Division I business session.

[Note: Revisions to the Convention Program were announced and voting procedures were explained.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Sweazy: Having gone through the details, we are ready to begin with Proposal No. 8. Does someone wish to move Proposal No. 8?

NCAA Membership Restructuring— Division I Board of Directors/Management Council

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I move Proposal No. 8. [The motion was seconded.]

I would also like to move Amendment 8-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment will establish minimal goals for gender and ethnic minority representation from the administrative regulations to the constitution, which then can be amended only by a two-thirds vote of the membership. This amendment is supported by the Presidents Commission. I urge your support.

Edward Leland (Stanford University): I rise on behalf of the Pac-10 Conference to oppose Amendment No. 8-1. We fully support Amendment No. 8. However, we feel that 8-1 prematurely locks in a set of procedures that we need time to fine tune. We urge defeat of 8-1.

John W. Bardo (Western Carolina University): I speak in favor of 8-1. The sponsors of 8-1 have been working with the NCAA staff to ensure that conferences will be involved in the selection process of representatives of the Board of Directors and the Management Council.

Proposal 8-1 does not change the minority or gender responsibility of the conference or Association. It simply moves Paragraph C of Proposal 8 from the administrative regulations to the constitution. It assures us that the conferences will remain involved in the process.

We all know the constitution has a higher threshold for change than our administrative regulations. We support Proposal No. 8 as amended by Proposal 8-1 and urge our colleagues to vote "yes" on 8-1.

Brother Thomas J. Scanlon (Manhattan College): I am a member of the Division I transition team. I speak on behalf of 8-1. As the members will recall last year when we approved restructuring, it was of great concern that we had not been able to address the question of gender and ethnic minori-

ty representation.

Part of the proposal last year promised that those issues would be addressed. The result is Proposal No. 8. I am confident that if we had the time last year, this would have been part of the initial presentation and, therefore, incorporated into the constitution. I think that it is appropriate that we do so now.

Col. Thomas W. Davis (Virginia Military Institute): I rise in support of Proposal No. 8-1 and urge my colleagues to join me in that support.

The authors of 8-1 believe that the involvement of conferences and institutions is critical to the success of the new governance model. By approving 8-1, we will ensure that any change to the process of representative selection is approved by the membership and not some unknown body of the future. We urge your support of Proposal No. 8, as amended by 8-1, to assure the stated selection process.

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): I just want to make sure that this proposal constitutionalizes the process and the numbers. Is that correct?

Mr. Sweazy: Only the process.

Mr. Delany: But not the numbers?

Mr. Sweazy: The base of Proposal No. 8 will put the numbers in the constitution. The amendment only constitutionalizes the process. If you adopt 8, after 8-1 is amended, the whole thing is in the constitution.

Mr. Delany: Thank you.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): My impression is that the two-thirds vote that would be needed would apply only to changing the process and not to changing the diversity goals, whether upwards or downwards, if we adopt 8-1 and then 8; is that correct?

Mr. Sweazy: That is correct.

[Proposal No. 8-1 (Page A-12) was adopted, 268-55-1.]

Carol C. Harter (University of Nevada, Las Vegas): On behalf of the Division I transition team, the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission, we move for the adoption of Proposal No. 8.

This proposal was developed by the Transition Board of Directors to address concerns about the diversity of representation in the Division I governance structure. The proposal is intended to be the response to 1996 Convention Proposal No. 9, a resolution overwhelmingly adopted that requires the Division I transition team to develop a plan for achieving the stated goals of the Presidents Commission for the new structure. The legislation establishes minimal goals for gender representation and ethnic minority representation on the new Board of Directors and the Management Council. It also sets forth a procedure for achieving those goals. The basic elements of the proposal were developed by a subcommittee of the transition board.

The committee reviewed information from the 1995 Division I task force that developed the basic Division I structure: the conferences represented in the new structure, the transition Management Council, the Committee on Women's Athletics, the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, and the Division I Steering Committee. The resulting recommendations have been broadly supported. The proposal sets forth specific goals that the Board of Directors will assure are met. The overall plan calls for a regular review of the goals by the Board to determine whether adjustments are needed. The transition board considered the initial goals to be a starting point and that diversity could be enhanced over time. The process for achiev-

ing the goals provides an opportunity for the conferences represented in this structure to make the first attempt at meeting them. The conferences will communicate within the Division I subdivisions to agree to provide a diverse group of representatives. If that cannot be accomplished, the Board will step in and make it happen. The transition board further stated that the minimal goals established for the Management Council will serve as a guideline for diversity of the membership of the Cabinet and committees of the division. I urge you to join the transition team, Commission and Council in support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 8 (Page A-9) was adopted as amended by 8-1, 311-6-1.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring— Division I Board of Directors/ Management Council/Cabinets

Samuel H. Smith (Washington State University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal represents a compromise of competing interests in allowing the Board and the Management Council freedom to select any member to serve as chair. It ensures an opportunity for representation of all subdivisions of Division I in the leadership positions of the new governance structure. There shall be among the chairs of the Board of Directors, Management Council and the four Cabinets, at least one representative of each subdivision.

The Council adopted this compromise between Proposal No. 10, which would prohibit the chairs of the Boards of the Management Council from being representatives of conferences in the same subdivision, and Proposal No. 11, which would give the Board and the Management Council complete freedom to select any member as chair. After reviewing the compromise, Presidents Commission members agreed to support Proposal No. 9 and withdraw No. 11.

The transition Board and Management Council also support Proposal No. 9 and oppose No. 10. We urge you to join the Presidents Commission in support of this proposal.

Mr. Scanlon: This compromise formulation, which worked its way through the transition process, assures that at least occasionally there will be someone from Division I-AA or I-AAA serving as the chair of the Board or the Management Council. It requires that at least once in every three terms, that is six years, there will be a rotation in terms of who serves as chair. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 9 (Page A-14) was adopted, 321-7-0.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Board of Directors

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): I am commissioner of the Southern Conference and a member of the Division I transition Management Council. On behalf of the Division I transition Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation will formalize in the NCAA constitution that an operating principle and system for rotating Division I-AA and I-AAA representatives to the Division I Board of Directors be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

In 1995, the Presidents Commission delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences the responsibility for developing such a process for Board of Directors and Management Council seats. This proposal merely formalizes the process as it relates to the Board of Directors' representatives from I-AA and I-AAA conferences. On behalf of the transition Management Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 12.

George M. Dennison (University of Montana): I serve on the Council and on the transition Board of Directors, but I speak for myself and for the Big Sky Conference. I urge your support of this proposal, which, as explained earlier, simply formalizes what is the current practice.

[Proposal No. 12 (Page A-17) was adopted 307-5-4.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Board of Directors

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

Similar to Proposal No. 12, this legislation will formalize in the NCAA's constitution that the term of office for Division I-AA and I-AAA members of the Division I Board of Directors be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

In 1995, the I-AA and I-AAA members of the Presidents Commission delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences the responsibility of developing and initiating a system for rotating Board and Management Council seats from those subdivisions on the new governance bodies. As part of this responsibility, the conferences developed a system for terms of office for the Board and the Management Council. This proposal merely formalizes the process as it relates to Division I-AA and I-AAA conference representatives on the Board of Directors. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 13. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 13 (Page A-18) was adopted, 308-4-5.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Management Council

Constance H. Hurlbut (Patriot League): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation will formalize in the NCAA constitution an operating principle that a system for rotating Division I-AA and I-AAA representatives to the Division I Management Council be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

In 1995, the I-AA and I-AAA members of the Presidents Commission delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences the responsibility of developing such a process for the Board of Directors and Management Council seats. This proposal merely formalizes the process as it relates to the Management Council representatives from I-AA and I-AAA conferences. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 14 (Page A-19) was adopted, 306-4-5.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Management Council

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation will formalize in the NCAA constitution that the term of office for Division I-AA and I-AAA members of the Division I Management Council be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

In 1995, the I-AA and the I-AAA members of the Presidents Commission delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences the responsibility of developing and initiating a system for rotating Board and Management Council seats from those subdivisions on the new governance bodies. As part of this responsibility, the conference has developed a system for terms of office for the Board and the Management Council. This proposal merely formalizes the process as it relates to Division I-AA and I-AAA conference representatives on the Management Council. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 15. Thank you.

Jon A. Steinbrecher (Mid-Continent Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I urge your support of Proposal No. 15. This legislation will empower I-AA and I-AAA conferences to determine the terms of office for the Management Council representatives. This formalizes the responsibility delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences by the Presidents Commission in developing the initial system for Board and Council seats. It worked and it should continue. On behalf of the sponsors, I ask your support of Proposal No. 15.

[Proposal No. 15 (Page A-20) was adopted, 310-3-4.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Board of Directors/Management Council

Constance H. Hurlbut (Patriot League): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation will permit Division I conferences to remove their representatives to the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council during their term of office. Since conferences would select their representatives to the Board and the Management Council in the new structure, it seems logical that they be permitted to remove their representatives. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support. Thank you.

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move for support of Proposal No. 16. Number 16 just develops a system of accountability for the representatives of the Council and Management Board. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 16 (Page A-21) was adopted, 238-74-6.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I-AA Governance Structure

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was developed to accommodate Division I-AA football-playing institutions in the governance of our sport. The Division I-AA conference representatives on the transition Management Council recognized early in the process of the need to provide an opportunity for other Division I-AA football-playing schools beyond those involved directly in the Management Council to participate in decisions governing the sport. This proposal is the product of evaluation by a subcommittee of the Management

Council and discussion with commissioners who administer I-AA football competition throughout the Association. It was unanimously supported. The NCAA Council decided to sponsor the legislation and the Presidents Commission has joined in.

Proposal No. 43, which also sought to establish a governance structure for I-AA football, will be withdrawn in favor of this proposal. Through the legislation, all multisport voting conferences with Division I-AA football championships and other football conferences administered by conferences that are represented in the governance structure will participate on a committee that has the authority to act on behalf of the Management Council on Division I-AA football matters. The committee's authority is limited to football issues only. I urge you to join the Presidents Commission, the Council and the Division I transition Management Team in support of this legislation. Thank you.

Douglas B. Fullerton (Big Sky Conference): We also rise to urge your support of Proposition 42. It simply ensures that all I-AA conferences that conduct a championship will have a voice in the new governance structure. This voice will be within the new structure as we define it this week and will be limited to I-AA issues only. We urge your support.

Gregory Sankey (Southland Conference): I am commissioner of the Southland Conference and the Southland Football League. I will be the third in a row to urge your support of Proposal No. 42. It does represent a reasonable compromise for I-AA governance. I urge your support of that proposal.

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-102) was adopted, 315-2-4.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Board of Directors/Management Council

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): I move Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is simply to eliminate an unnecessary distinction between Division I-AA and I-AAA representation on the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council.

It is important to note three things that this proposal does not do. It will not change the balance of representation on anybody within the new Division I structure. It is not intended to change each subdivision's responsibility to achieve diverse representation. It will not materially affect how Division I business is conducted.

It is true this proposal really changes little, but it would reinforce that the conferences listed on Page 21 are all Division I conferences, period. It has become all too commonplace for subdivisional labels to be stuck on to our nonfootball programs. Even The NCAA News recently made reference to the Division I-A basketball programs. Passage of Proposal No. 17 would in a small way eliminate unwarranted and misleading labeling of our non-football programs in Division I. If Proposal 17 passes, the impact will be minor but the message significant, nonetheless.

[Proposal No. 17 (Page A-21) was adopted, 238-74-6.]

Frederick W. Obear (University of Tennessee at Chattanooga): I would like to raise a point of order. Some of us wanted to speak on Proposal 17. We didn't realize you were moving along until after the call for the vote. Is there some way to correct that situation? We didn't hear you ask for further speak-

ers on that proposal.

Mr. Sweazy: We will have an answer for you in just a moment. I am advised by the parliamentarian that we could not allow additional comment on the proposal unless it was misunderstood. I do not believe it was misunderstood. Therefore, there will be no opportunity to further discuss Proposal No. 17. I would remind the delegates that if they wish to speak to a proposal, they should be in place at a microphone in a very timely fashion.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I would ask in all fairness that there be a bit more of a pause before you move to a vote. We did seem to go with more speed on that one.

Mr. Sweazy: I only wish I could move that fast. Your comment is well taken and we will.

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Management Council

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation will expand the pool of potential Division I Management Council members by including institutional administrators to whom athletics departments report or who have other significant duties regarding athletics.

This legislation is necessary to create as large a pool as possible of potential Management Council members, which will provide the highest quality of representation and increase the opportunity to achieve diversity in representation. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 18. Thank you.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the cosponsors, I simply want to note that for many of us, the opportunity to provide additional diversity, particularly for people of color, will depend on our ability to adopt this legislation and to ask for service from people who otherwise would not be eligible but who are qualified and would be willing to serve. In our conference that could significantly improve the pool of people on whom we can draw and we would hope that the body will adopt it. Thank you.

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I rise to speak against the proposal. We do not oppose diversity and we do not oppose institutional administrators. We do, however, have 30 members of our conference's council, faculty representatives, directors and senior women administrators eager to serve here and on the Cabinets. Before we go outside of these people who have been made responsible for our programs, we would like them to have the initial opportunity to serve.

Jennifer Alley (National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators): On behalf of NACWAA, I ask you that you oppose Proposal 18. NACWAA agrees with the goals of the sponsor to provide the highest quality representation on the Management Council and appreciates the attempt to address the concern that there are not as many women or minorities employed in athletics or appointed to serve as faculty athletics representatives as the NCAA would like. However, we believe that the pool of women and minorities available without this amendment is sufficient to provide the highest quality representation to the Management Council and at levels that cannot only meet, but exceed, the minimums of the goals adopted in Proposal No. 8.

Assuming there is an average of one woman and one minority from each

Division I campus, we are confident that 13 women and seven minorities from a pool of 300 would be willing, able and qualified to serve. There is not a need to expand the pool to include administrators whose primary expertise and campus experiences lie outside of athletics. NACWAA asks that you vote against Proposal 18.

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I am a member of the transition Management Council. I urge support of this legislation. I would submit that the pool is not large enough to satisfy the goals of diversity. I certainly recognize that we have many qualified people to serve on these committees. However, the traditional group from which we draw, I don't think is sufficient. I believe that we will better satisfy the goals of diversity by expanding the pool. I urge your support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 18 (Page A-24) was adopted, 203-122-4.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Management Council

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow permanent alternates on the Management Council in instances where the individual appointed to serve is unable to attend for a compelling reason.

Roughly two-thirds of the conferences in Division I and two-thirds of the institutions are represented in the new structure by only one representative on the Management Council. If that person is unable to attend a Management Council session for any reason, that Council will be deprived of the representation of that conference and the conference will be deprived of the ability to participate in governance. We have already on the transition Management Council had one instance in which an individual could not attend because of a hurricane. I learned this morning that one of my colleagues on the transition Council is expecting a child within 30 days of the next scheduled meeting of the transition Council.

I think it is imperative that we not burden individuals and conferences with choosing between attending Management Council functions when they truly have a compelling need to stay home for whatever reason. On the other hand, we don't want to deprive their conference of the ability to be represented. We have talked throughout the restructuring process about the need for presidential control. I would say to the presidents of I-AA and I-AAA institutions that if you want control over your conferences' participation in the NCAA, you must provide for your representation on the Management Council when your appointed representatives cannot attend for what you deem to be an appropriate reason. The only way to do that is to vote in favor of Proposal No. 20. Thank you.

Milton A. Gordon (California State University, Fullerton): The Presidents Commission is going to move 19. We are going to oppose No. 20. We think that No. 19 establishes a process for alternates that will be more consistent with the earlier restructuring.

Jon A. Steinbrecher (Mid-Continent Conference): Inasmuch as I-AA and I-AAA conferences will have at best one representative on the Management Council, if they are unable to attend, we are essentially disenfranchised. Because of that, I urge your support of Proposal No. 20.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-25) was adopted, 232-94-1.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Management Council Administrative Committee

Constance H. Hurlbut (Patriot League): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Division I transition Management Council believes in the new structure. Much like in the current structure, there will be a need for governance structure action between regularly scheduled meetings of the Management Council. It was agreed that the best way to handle interim activities would be through a four-member subcommittee of the Management Council that includes representatives from each of the three subdivisions. Also, the transition Board of Directors noted that this Administrative Committee is being created for the purpose of handling routine administrative functions that are necessary to the functioning of the division.

All actions of the Administrative Committee must be approved in the following meeting of the entire Management Council. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 21 (Page A-26) was adopted, 323-6-0.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—NCAA Committee Structure

Samuel H. Smith (Washington State University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and Council, I move Proposal No. 28-N.

[The motion was seconded.]

Carol A. Cartwright (Kent State University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 28-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The proposed amendment does not alter the numerical balance that will exist in the restructured Cabinet of the NCAA. The overall allocation between Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-AAA will remain unaffected. The amendment does not affect any identified Cabinet positions allocated to a conference or to a division. It simply changes the idea in the current version of 28-N, which would require that two conferences share Cabinet positions.

We believe this is inappropriate since conferences that are entirely Division I-A in all athletics programs should have at least one seat on each Cabinet. This proposal has the support of the NCAA Council and the support of the Presidents Commission. We believe that our experience and diversity is important in resolving and defining issues that will be adjudicated on the Cabinet level. We therefore seek an identification role in each Cabinet as opposed to a shared role. We urge your support for this amendment.

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I have been asked to speak by several individuals about this issue. There are going to be quite a few "no" votes in Division I-A on this proposal, but we have worked out among the I-A conferences exactly what the intent of the sponsors is. They will have these seats as they propose. We have not elected, as our colleagues in I-AA and I-AAA have done, to put a lot of these procedures and numerical divisions into the bylaws and constitution at this time. We prefer to see how things go in the early stages of our new structure. But we do support their intent, and that has been agreed upon by the I-A conferences.

William E. Shelton (Eastern Michigan University): Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Presidents Commission. We certainly appreciate the facts that we just heard. But as the legislation currently stands, that is not the

way it is written. This does not change the allocation in I-AA nor I-AAA, but it does ensure two I-A conferences that now only have a fractional position, one representative each. We ask that you support this. Thank you.

Milton A. Gordon (California State University, Fullerton): I am a member of the Presidents Commission and also president of California State University at Fullerton. Those of us in the Big West and in the Mid-American feel that this is a matter of fairness. This will not negatively, as was already stated, impact any of the other conference representations. We urge all of the delegates to support and pass this particular part of Proposal 28-1.

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada, Reno): I speak in support of No. 28-N. I do not do so as the chair of the transition oversight committee. That committee did not discuss this issue. However, that body and its predecessor body that prepared the framework legislation last year was characterized continuously by efforts at accommodating the needs of the member institutions.

Part of that accommodation process in the first year involved the two conferences affected here—the Big West and the Mid-American—sharing a member on the Division I Board of Directors and having an entitlement to only one representative each on the Management Council. We accepted that. Given the previous remarks indicating that there is no particular opposition to the intent of this legislation, I believe that a fair accommodation that would follow on the history of two years of accommodation in getting us to this point would suggest that there would be no harm done by voting in support of Proposition No. 28-1. I would like to express my support for that proposition.

[Proposal No. 28-1 (Page A-85) was adopted, 187-72-69.]

Mr. Sweazy: I would remind the delegates that in the general session this morning that Proposal No. 34 was passed. That proposal had the effect of changing the process of selecting Cabinet members. Other than that, we are proceeding with 28 as it stands in the Official Notice.

Mr. Smith: I would like to speak to 28-N. This proposal is a centerpiece of the work of the Division I transition team during 1996. It establishes a substructure in Division I but needs the Board of Directors and Management Council that were created in the 1996 Convention. It is a culmination of the structural changes that began with the work of the Division I task force in the fall of 1994. The proposal took a concept suggested by the task force and fully developed it. A subcommittee of the transition Management Council, chaired by Jim Jarrett, put together detailed recommendations that led to the legislation.

It was recommended by the Management Council and the Board of Directors, and sponsored by the Council and the Presidents Commission; thus, it was developed through conference representatives in a test of the way the new structure will work. Basically, the proposal takes a majority of current standing committees and replaces them with four top specific Cabinets. This is intended to move away from business as usual to a new way of doing things. Accordingly, the Cabinets are provided considerable flexibility to develop the best means of handling their assignments and developing recommendations for the Management Council and the Board.

The Cabinets must use flexibility creatively to permit a cleaner, more streamlined operation of the new structure. The Cabinets are large bodies of 26 to 34 members who provide an opportunity for broad involvement of the membership in the governance structure. Conferences represented in

the governance structure are assured of opportunities to be involved in the Cabinet structure. It is anticipated that the Cabinets may choose to break into subcommittees to handle detailed issues, with the full Cabinet approving recommendations forwarded to the Council and the Board.

The Cabinets are composed of faculty athletics representatives and athletics administrators. They will be expected to identify the best means for ensuring regular involvement by other important constituencies and experts such as coaches, financial aid officers, registrars and admissions officers in the new structure, and making recommendations for such involvement to the Management Council. Four Association-wide committees have been retained or developed in other parts of Proposal No. 28. The Division I members of those committees generally will report to the Cabinet responsible for that topic area. Thus, even though the Association-wide committee may exist to permit discussion across division lines, any changes in Division I policy or legislation will come through the normal governance and legislative processes in the new structure.

The current sports committee structure is essentially retained in the new structure and will report to the Championship/Competition Cabinet. This will ensure continuity of championship administration and include the review of championship matters in the mainstream of the governance structure.

The legislation also assures that student-athletes will continue to be involved in the governance of the division. A Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, composed of a student-athlete from each conference in the governance structure, will report directly to the Management Council. Two of its members will join the Management Council in review of legislative issues and other matters of interest to student-athletes. Thus, the students can speak to issues at the decision-making point in much the same way as they speak on this Convention floor to legislation under consideration. We urge you to join the Division I transition team, the Presidents Commission and the Council in support of this proposal.

This will complete the new Division I structure to the point that it can begin addressing substantive issues.

Bridget Niland (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/State University of New York at Buffalo): We appreciate the efforts of restructuring the committee to include the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee at the Management Council level. We hope that participation will include not only representation, but also a vote.

As student-athletes, we are the ones who are affected in our daily lives by the rules and regulations adopted by this membership. It is only logical that we, the student-athletes, have a say in those rules and how they are adopted. Thank you very much.

[Part N of Proposal No. 28 (Page A-36) was adopted as amended by No. 28-1, 300-7-7.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Committees

Claire Van Ummersen (Cleveland State University): On behalf of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference, I move to adopt Proposal No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

Having been advised that committee replacements would not occur except by attrition, the MCC withdraws Proposal No. 32-1. The original restructuring plan clearly gives Division I-A members a majority voice on the Board

of Directors and the Management Council. We believe the level of participation in football should not dictate membership on a soccer committee, the Walter Byers Scholarship Committee, and so on. The transition Board of Directors has established an informal policy of committee representation that is 50 percent I-A, 25 percent I-AA and 25 percent I-AAA.

Proposal No. 32 does not contradict this policy, but only codifies it. We believe the constitution should include language that limits any subdivision from having a majority of more than 50 percent representation beyond the Board of Directors, Management Council, Cabinets and any football-related committees. This proposal is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Division I restructuring. We urge its adoption.

Mr. Smith: On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the transition Board of Directors, I speak in opposition to this proposal. This legislation eliminates the flexibility that would permit the new structure to put together a committee to meet specific concerns that can be best addressed by a committee with a majority from a specific subdivision. Such an approach will result in committees that are about 50 percent Division I-A representatives and 25 percent from the other two divisions. This was the approach used for the composition of the Cabinets, as specified in Proposal No. 28-N. The Board is further committed to assuring that all subdivisions of the membership are generally represented in new committees. Adoption of this legislation would require the modification of current committees that have a majority from a single subdivision without any indication that makeup has been a problem.

Some current sports committees have a majority from a single subdivision, only because those individuals may have been the most qualified in relation to that particular sport at the time they were selected. The subdivisions have remained supportive of the work of such committees with the understanding that changes in their composition could occur with future appointments. This flexibility should continue. Restrictions on committee composition should exist only when needed to protect a particular interest. The Board and Management Council should retain the opportunity to address that on a case-by-case basis. I urge you strongly to join the Board and the Presidents Commission in opposing this proposal.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): As a member of the transition Management Council, I would urge the delegates to support this proposal.

I would note with all due respect to President Smith that the Cabinets were not constructed on a proposal that no more than 50 percent of the seats should go to any subdivision, but, in fact, each Cabinet explicitly has a I-A majority. I think the transition Management Council's work has been marked by an extraordinary degree of cooperation across all three subdivisions. Nonetheless, I think for those of us in Divisions I-AA and I-AAA, whose members are a majority of the division and a majority of the teams competing in every sport except perhaps football, that it makes common and equitable sense to simply say no subdivision should have more than 50 percent of membership in any committee. Thank you.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): I rise to support Proposal 32. It is the only thing that is possibly close to democracy in this restructuring. I urge this Convention to support it. Thank you.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I am a member of the Division I Board. I am rising in support of President Humphries' position as well as the ones articulated by the president of Cleveland State

University and Jeff Orleans from the Ivy Group.

Only in this way will we get equity and at least some kind of movement toward a "level" playing field. Let's vote "yes" on No. 32.

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): There doesn't seem to be any reason to have a committee structure. That doesn't seem to be any reason when we establish the numbers. The numbers are a big thing. They are a big thing to people in I-A and a big thing to people outside I-A.

But the Board of Directors has a simple majority of I-A representatives. The Management Council has the same. The Cabinets have the same. Why we would create a limitation on that simple majority of the committee system is beyond me. I know that it will be difficult to get a majority on this particular vote, but it seems to me that the committee system that will be reacting to some charges from the Cabinets and the Management Council ought to be able to at least have the simple majority to deal with what the other three groups enjoy. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 32 (Page A-91) was adopted, 210-120-0.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Cabinets

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation, much like Proposal 18, will expand the full potential of Cabinet members by including institutional administrators to whom athletics departments report or have other significant duties regarding athletics.

This legislation is necessary to create as large of a pool as possible of potential Cabinet members who will provide the highest quality of representation and increase opportunity to achieve diversity in representation. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 33. Thank you.

Jennifer Allen (National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators): On behalf of the NACWAA, I ask you to oppose Proposal No. 33.

While we do not question the sponsor's good intentions, we do question the presumption that there is not an efficient number of qualified women or minorities from whom to choose to achieve the 35-percent and the 20-percent goal adopted with Proposition 8 without the expansion of this pool. The goals for the Cabinet representation translate to a minimum of 44 women, 24 minorities to be chosen from a staff of approximately 300 institutions. We also believe that the membership is better served by limiting the pool of those with direct experience in athletics as administrators or faculty athletics representatives. On this principle, NACWAA asks you to vote "no" on Proposition No. 33.

[Proposal No. 33 (Page A-92) was adopted, 219-108-1.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Legislative Process

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the transition Management Council, the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Ensor: On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 35-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 35-2 only extends the provision of 35 to policies and proce-

dures of Division I. We urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 35-2 (Page A-95) was adopted, 255-56-8.]

Jonathan B. Lecrone (Midwestern Collegiate Conference): I move Proposal No. 35-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 35-1 simply codifies the ability of a Management Council member to submit legislation for both special Conventions and the full legislative process. Under the conference-based representative system, this is a needed amendment. It is consistent with the spirit and the intent of a restructured Division I. We urge your adoption.

[Proposal No. 35-1 (Page A-95) was adopted, 260-56-1.]

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): Proposal No. 35 would make clear that the entire new legislative process—from the introduction of the legislation through potentially the override process—would begin when any single duly appointed representative to either the Board of Directors or the Management Council introduces legislation. It is in that sense more of a housekeeping measure than anything else that is designed to make very clear how this new process will work. I urge the body to adopt it.

[Proposal No. 35 (Page A-94) was adopted as amended by Nos. 35-1 and 35-2, 277-16-0.]

[The Division I business session was recessed at 11:50 a.m.]

Monday Afternoon, January 13, 1997

The meeting was called to order at 1:45 p.m., with Mr. Sweazy presiding.

Mr. Sweazy: We will please come to order. We are now ready for Proposal No. 36.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Legislative Process

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the transition Management Council, the Presidents Commission and the Council, I move Proposal No. 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is a technical matter, which makes clear that in the override process the new structure may apply to both the Management Council and the Board of Directors in the area where the relevant body is asked to act on legislation and declines to act.

The current legislation that we adopted in January applies to the Board. It was intended to apply to the Management Council. Through a drafting omission, it did not apply to the Council. This amendment would simply cure that technical defect. I urge its adoption.

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I urge your support and passage. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 36 (Page A-96) was adopted, 302-1-0.]

Patricia Viverito (Gateway Football Conference): It is my understanding that the sponsors of Proposals 37, 38 and 39 were going to withdraw those proposals. I did have a point of information that was related to that.

Mr. Sweazy: Patty, you would withdraw those proposals if 36 would pass?

Ms. Viverito: That is my understanding.

Mr. Sweazy: Do you want to wait to see if it passes?

Ms. Viverito: I can ask the question anyway. Special Conventions in the future, can there be some clarification of what the voting process would be

at such a Convention?

Mr. Sweazy: If there is a special Convention, it will be one institution, one vote. If we get there, there will be the override process.

Ms. Viverito: Thank you very much

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Legislative Process

Mr. Ensor: On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal specifies that a regular or alternate member of the Board of Directors may introduce Division I legislation to the full Board of Directors, which would subsequently initiate the entire legislative process. Since we have moved to a conference-based representation system, it only makes sense that a conference representative on the Board would have the ability to initiate the full legislative process. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for Proposal No. 40. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 40 (Page A-101) was adopted, 317-2-0.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Legislative Process

Mr. Ensor: On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

One of the features in the new Division I legislative process is a system wherein the Division I institutions can call for a vote to override a legislative decision.

This legislation merely clarifies that override voting by the Division I membership on legislative action taken by the Board of Directors or the Management Council in areas delegated to them should be on the principle of one institution, one vote, and should be a recorded roll-call vote. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 41. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 41 (Page A-101) was adopted, 318-1-1.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Legislative Process

Marcy Gorton (Western Carolina University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 44 is a simple administrative procedure that makes available to the I-A governance model we previously passed the same protection that is available to the full Management Council and Board of Directors. The ratios of required votes will be identical. It ensures that the new I-AA governance model is available to review by the I-AA membership. On behalf of its sponsors, I urge your support.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): As chair of the transition Management Council Subcommittee on I-AA Governance, I have been asked why this was not included in 42, which passed earlier? The answer to that is negligence by the chairman of the committee, and I apologize. But this is without opposition from the subcommittee of the transition Management Council. It simply provides to I-AA governance the same options that are available to the same full Management Council and the same proportions as the full Management Council vote. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 44 (Page A-104) was adopted, 296-5-16.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Interpretative Process

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): On behalf of the

Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal merely modifies a current process for interpreting legislation affecting Division I institutions to conform to the revised membership structure. It does not represent a significant change in the process. The legislation permits reviews by the Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet and appeals to the Management Council with final interpretative authority on Division I legislation resting with the Management Council. Please note that the Board of Directors retains ultimate supervisory authority through its general power to ratify, amend or rescind the actions of the Division I Management Council. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 46.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-106) was adopted, 321-1-3.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Revenue Guarantee

Mr. Yeager: On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

Joseph E. Etzel (University of Portland): On behalf of the Council and the transition Management Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 47-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal clarifies the definition of a joint marketing venture as suggested in Proposal No. 47. It provides for approval of programs, policies and principles related to joint marketing ventures.

Rather than creating a new Division I committee on marketing, this proposal directs the Finance Cabinet to review joint marketing ventures. This charge is consistent with the duties already set forth with Cabinet Proposal 28-N and avoids establishing a new committee.

Concern was expressed about disruption of the day-to-day activities of the NCAA if each contract had to be approved. The joint venture would require approval by the governance structure. The amendment requires that the program be approved and allows the contracts necessary to implement the programs to be handled without the need for having each individual one approved. On behalf of the Council, I urge your adoption of this proposal.

Mr. Sweazy: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak to the amendment-to-the-amendment No. 47-1? Please understand that we will separate this amendment-to-the-amendment and vote separately on Parts A and B. Proposal 47-1-A is a dominant provision and thus requires a two-thirds vote for passage. No. 47-1-B requires a simple majority. We will vote on 47-1-A only. We will have to wait on the results before we vote on Part B.

[Part A of Proposal No. 47-1 (Page A-109) was adopted, 311-11-2.]

Mr. Sweazy: We are now ready to vote on 47-1-B, then we are ready to consider No. 47-2.

[Part B of Proposal No. 47-1 (Page A-109) was adopted, 312-9-1.]

Mr. Ensor: On behalf of the NCAA Steering Committee and the Council, I move adoption of 47-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of No. 47-2 is just to clarify that Proposal 47 applies to championships currently sponsored by the NCAA in Division I and would not apply to any future I-A football championships. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 47-2 (Page A-110) was adopted, 308-13-2.]

Mr. Sweazy: I would note that because No. 47-1-B passed, it deletes 47-B. Therefore, we will be voting on 47-A only, as amended.

[Part A of Proposal No. 47 (Page A-108) was adopted as amended by Nos. 47-1-A and 47-2, 278-41-0.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring— Waiver of Division I Revenue Guarantee

Robert W. Lawless (University of Tulsa): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal provides a limited amount of flexibility to the Board of Directors in waiving certain aspects of the proportionality requirements of the Division I revenue guarantees adopted at the 1996 NCAA Convention. It allows the Board to approve uniform increases in the academic enhancement, conference grant and special assistance funds. These are the funds from which Division I members benefit equally regardless of their subdivision membership.

For example, this legislation would permit the Board to approve an equal increase in the amount of the academic enhancement fund, even if that fund increased at a greater rate than the overall increase in the Division I revenue distributed through all the guaranteed funds. It does not provide as much flexibility as some on the Commission would like, but it is a reasonable compromise for those who were the primary components of the guarantee.

As you will recall in the 1996 Convention, the commitment was made by those components to provide greater flexibility in the future. This proposal is intended to meet that commitment. I urge you to join the Commission, the Council and Division I transition team in support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-111) was adopted 319-4-1.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Championships

Constance H. Hurlbut (Patriot League): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal affirms in the NCAA constitution that not more than one national championship shall be conducted in each men's and women's Division I sports except football. The proposal is not controversial in nature in that it merely codifies the commitment made during the discussions related to the revised membership structure that national championships would be retained in their present form. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support.

Brad Kinsman (University of Detroit Mercy): On behalf of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference, I rise in support of Proposal No. 49. This proposal simply confirms what was agreed upon at the 1996 Convention. I urge your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 49 (Page A-112) was adopted, 322-1-0.]

Membership Requirements—Provisional Membership

Vivian L. Fuller (Northeastern Illinois University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council believes that the establishment of an additional education-

al year in the provisional membership period will assist the Association's educational efforts related to provisional members. Currently, there is a one-year educational period, which has not provided provisional members with the time needed to be in full compliance during the final two years of its provisional membership period. The proposal would benefit both provisional members and the Association as a whole by providing additional tasks and education for provisional members. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for Proposal No. 55.

[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-118) was adopted, 311-10-1.]

Athletics Certification—Operating Principles

James O'Hanlon (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Committee on Athletics Certification, I move Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

At last year's Convention, a resolution was adopted that directed the Committee on Athletics Certification to work with the Presidents Commission to develop legislation that would incorporate sportsmanship and ethical conduct as a specific component in the certification program.

Over the course of this past year, the Committee on Athletics Certification has studied the matter and concluded that this important new topic should be promptly placed among the certification program operating principles. The committee drafted the language that you see before you in Proposal No. 57 by using excerpts from the final report of the NCAA Presidents Commission's Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics.

The Committee on Athletics Certification believes that the new language best fits the new certification area to be titled "Equity, Welfare and Sportsmanship." It should also be referenced in the existing governance and commitment to rules compliance section.

This proposal, which does not become effective until the second cycle of the certification program, has received the full support of the Presidents Commission and of the Council. I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 57. Thank you.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): I would like to request that we consider 57-A and 57-B separately.

Mr. Sweazy: Consider it done.

Mr. Orleans: If I could speak to those proposals, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sweazy: Please do.

Mr. Orleans: Thank you. We support 57-A unequivocally. However, we have, I must say, serious reservations about the kind of uniformity and detail that 57-B would impose on institutions in the very first attempts at reaching these very important values through the certification process. In our view, it would be far more preferable since 57-B will not take effect until the next cycle of certification to ask a relevant group under the new structure to reconsider the material contained in 57-B to try to draft proposals that are less detailed and, in our view, less cumbersome and provide greater flexibility for institutions and conferences to meet these important values and not be bound in as much detail as they would be bound under these provisions by the rules of the certification committee, particularly since the certification groups will have had no experience enforcing or reviewing these principles when these materials take effect. Thank you.

[Part A of Proposal No. 57 (Page A-121) was adopted, 318-8-0.]

Mr. Orleans: I would move to refer 57-B to the appropriate group under the new governance structure to move as quickly as possible to review and, if possible, define this legislation and bring it back for reconsideration under the new structure.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Sweazy: It has been moved and seconded that we refer 57-B to the Management Council, Jeff?

Mr. Orleans: I am not sure whether it is the Board or the Council, but to the appropriate body.

Mr. Sweazy: All right.

R. Gerald Turner (Southern Methodist University): I am the chair of the appropriate committee here. We can follow suit with what has been suggested and work on it. We have tried working with the Council to come up with the wording that seemed to be the intent of the Convention.

There is the opportunity to pass this wording and then have it modified through the same procedure that is being talked about. But the time frame is a problem. When we start working with universities, there is not a great deal of time between the passage of this and when it would be implemented with the next cycle.

Mr. Sweazy: Excuse me, President Turner. We are only speaking now on the motion to refer.

Mr. Turner: I would ask the Convention not to defer it, but to pass this and then we will try modifying it by working with the Board of Directors of the appropriate group. This would give us the direction to work on it in the meantime toward getting ready for this next cycle. I would ask that we not refer it, but vote it in at this Convention.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 57-B (Page A-121) to the new governance structure was adopted, 201-15-1.]

Athletics Certification—Division I

Mr. Ensor: On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move for adoption of Proposal No. 58. I believe there is a motion to amend.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Turner: As a member of the Committee on Athletics Certification, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 58-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Committee on Athletics Certification initially was opposed to Proposal No. 58 because it had not completed a study that it was undertaking to review, among a number of other things, the appropriate frequency in the certification program. Over 600 individuals who had participated in the program to date were a part of this survey. This fall, we were able to complete the review and discussion of the survey results. We found that almost 70 percent of the respondents favored a cycle of more than five years.

The certification program itself and its governing principles are the product of the votes of this membership. Therefore, based on the results of the study and the review of the various alternatives, the committee supports the concept of a 10-year certification cycle with a five-year interim status report as outlined in Proposal No. 58. The committee, however, had concerns about the detailed aspects of Proposal No. 58 and in particular: One, that the interim report was not to be acted upon by the certification committee

and; two, that an institution's place in the 10-year schedule could not be adjusted by the committee relative to where it was in the first cycle.

Proposal No. 58-1 corrects the deficiencies and provides the certification committee with the time and flexibility to determine the appropriate content in the interim report and to a 10-year cycle using the principles as outlined in Bylaw 33.3.1. This study undertakes issues relating to the transition to a 10-year cycle. The committee also recognized that some institutions would be required to complete their second participation in the program less than 10 years after their first.

Proposal No. 58-1 gives the committee the opportunity to recommend a rule change next year that would not require an interim report of institutions that have less than seven years between self-studies, while institutions that have seven to 10 years between the self-studies would have to complete the interim report as No. 58 requires. I ask you to join the Council and the certification committee in supporting this amendment-to-amendment 58-1. Thank you.

Mr. Ensor: On behalf of the original proposers of No. 58, the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, we rise in support of 58-1 as outlined by Dr. Turner.

Hoke L. Smith (Towson State University): As a member of the 30 percent, I regret the longer cycle. I believe that in intercollegiate athletics things have changed so rapidly and will change so rapidly that 10 years is a long time. Many of us have found that either in institutions that we have visited or in our own institution. Certification has helped us solve problems in compliance, planning for gender equity, dealing with the boosters, recruiting and institutional control. At this meeting, I have heard the familiar phrase "slippery slope" referred to programs aimed at assisting student-athletes with a different distribution of financial aid to recruiting changes.

My concern is that 10 years is a long time and our rules book has been thick and ineffective in many cases. I realize the reality of your recommendation. I strongly urge that this amendment be approved with particular emphasis upon the five-year action statement. We're hoping that in addition to the five-year simple review and guidance for the 10-year program, that the committee could trigger an early visitation if there is evidence that it is warranted.

I still intend to vote against this because I believe that the five-year review, along with at least 30 percent of my colleagues, is an appropriate period of time given the complexity of the NCAA.

[Proposal No. 58-1 (Page A-124) was adopted, 293-33-0.]

Jennifer Alley (National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators): The NACWAA opposes the adoption of Proposal 58. A majority of the problems identified on campuses by the certification process have related to equity issues. The NACWAA is concerned that delaying the certifications another round will delay the implementation of plans to correct these situations for students on those campuses. While the proposal includes the provision for the committee on certification to review an interim report and a five-year mark, the certification decision will not be rendered until the next cycle, another five years later.

We fear that under this system, the evolving standards of the NCAA will not keep pace with the needs of student-athletes. While we appreciate the significant administrative burdens involved in completing a full self-study evaluation, we believe the NCA cannot afford the luxury of lifting that burden at this cost. The NACWAA asks for your vote in opposition to Proposal

No. 58. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 58 (Page A-124) was adopted as amended by No. 58-1, 310-15-1.]

Vehicle Registration—Division I Football and Basketball

Larry R. Gerlach (University of Utah): On behalf of the Council and the Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

During the past two years, the Professional Sports Liaison Committee and the Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism, chaired by President Brit Kirwan of the University of Maryland, have investigated the growing problem of improper involvement by sports agents and agent types in inter-collegiate athletics.

Automobiles have been identified as one of the principal material benefits offered by agents to entice student-athletes into relationships that violate NCAA regulations. Requiring vehicle registration for participants in Division I football and men's and women's basketball will assist institutions in monitoring a significant area of illicit agent activity and also serve as a deterrent to student-athletes who might otherwise be tempted to accept such an improper benefit.

Although the proposal, which is supported by the Presidents Commission, applies only to those sports most prone to agent-related problems, many institutions already require automobile registration by student-athletes. Because it will help curb an area of significant sports-agent abuse, I urge your support of Proposal No. 60.

Mr. Ensor: A point of order. Are we going to subdivide this vote?

Mr. Sweazy: We will indeed subdivide this vote according to sport. We will vote on football and then on basketball. The football vote is a federated vote in I-A and I-AA.

Mr. Ensor: I rise to speak against Proposal No. 60, the automobile registration legislation. In this age when we talk of deregulation, as well intended as this proposal is, it is putting an across-the-board regulation that really applies to only segments of our Association and division. We would urge that as we attempt to deregulate, this is actually a proposal that should be addressed by conferences on an individual basis. Many conferences and member institutions don't need the paperwork that will come as a result of this proposal.

As a result of that, we suggest that it is much better for the conference to deal with it on its own level and we would urge opposition to this proposal. Thank you.

Noel Ragsdale (University of Southern California): I rise also to urge a "no" vote. We actually do require all of our student-athletes to register their cars. But I think it is inappropriate to make it a requirement in legislation so that not only would there be a violation if there is a problem with the car, but now it will be a violation to not properly register it with the school and all the kind of attendant paperwork related to that. This seems to be a compliance matter that should be kept within the institution and something that the institutions do to protect themselves. That is the place to leave it and not make it a requirement in this form.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-127) was adopted in Division I-A, 73-44-0; defeated in Division I-AA, 18-101-2. The proposal was defeated for basketball,

134-180-2.]

Financial Aid—Division I Employment Earnings

William E. Kirwan (University of Maryland, College Park): On behalf of the Council and the Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism, and with the support of the Presidents Commission, I move adoption of Proposition No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Ohio State University): On behalf of the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move No. 62-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 62-1 requires the student-athlete, prior to the commencement of employment, to sign an affidavit as specified in the legislation to be kept on file in the athletics department.

We believe that Proposal 62 adds a layer of compliance that would require that a student-athlete, prior to commencing employment, sign an affidavit attesting to the conditions described in the legislation. This is an added safeguard and will increase the opportunity for abuse in the compliance process. I urge adoption of 62-1.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): In our conference discussion yesterday, the question was raised how an affidavit really helps. In other words, if the information without the affidavit is false, that is an NCAA violation. If the affidavit is not adhered to, that is a crime. But is that the kind of thing that we would try to enforce? It is just a question. Maybe Andy could answer that, please.

Mr. Geiger: I understand the concern raised by the delegate. I think that if there are problems with this, as we have with previous legislation, they could be worked on by a committee. I think it is really important that we find a way to get the student-athlete involved in this process. This does add significantly to the compliance burden in the program. Perhaps the staff could help the chair with some of these issues as well.

Mr. Sweazy: This really came from the Council. The purpose of the affidavit was to ensure that both the employer and the student-athlete and the athletics department knew of the pending arrangements.

Dan Gibbens, I hope that answers your question. Thank you, Mr. Geiger.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): This amendment is demeaning to the student-athlete. We're asking him to sign an affidavit when we know there are many needy athletes who need to work. I think we should provide them that right and not ask them to certify that they mean to do right when they work.

They earn you a lot of money and it is demeaning to them. I don't think you should ask them to do this. I urge you not to support this amendment requiring the student-athletes to sign an affidavit that they are going to be good.

[Proposal No. 62-1 (page A-129) was adopted, 190-127-6.]

Joseph A. Etzel (University of Portland): On behalf of the Council, we would like to move to separate Section B from the proposal.

Mr. Sweazy: Consider it done. It does not require a vote.

Robert J. Frank (Oregon State University): I support the student's right to work. However, I have serious misgivings about a bylaw that says who may receive earnings up to the cost of attendance. I have talked to a number of people about the tremendous compliance difficulties that I think this

is going to create. I can imagine trying to monitor it day-to-day when the student, in fact, reaches that point. For that reason, I would urge the membership to vote down 62 and resurrect 63. Thank you.

Bridget Niland (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/State University of New York at Buffalo): The student-athletes of this Association strongly urge this membership to allow us the opportunity to gain valuable work experience. There are three reasons why this membership should adopt legislation that allows us to work.

First, there are often financial needs that are not covered within the scope of a full scholarship. These needs could be from filling your gas tank and doing your laundry to being a responsible contributor to the household family income back at home. We have instances where student-athletes, who through their summer earnings and their part-time work experience, need to contribute something back home to their families. This is a very real need that exists out there.

Second, athletics experience, although extremely valuable, as we heard last night, cannot be compared with real work experience. On our committee, we have heard numerous stories from international-caliber athletes who have walked in to work interviews and had interviewers praise them for their athletics ability, but then they ask, "what work experience do you have?"

Holding a part-time job teaches us responsibility, accountability and the ability to learn and provide after we graduate from college. The majority of Division I student-athletes do not go on to earn a living as an athlete. We need the work experience. We have met this issue several times. In my three years on the committee, it has come up each year. This is the time to address this issue. Cedric Dempsey, in his speech last night, and the presidents asked us this morning to work and consider the welfare of the student-athletes when we are looking at legislation.

They also asked us to look at this legislation on the principles of honesty and compliance, not fear of abuse. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly urges this Association to allow us the opportunity to work. Thank you.

Andrew Sorensen (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): I would like to express grave reservations regarding Proposal No. 62 and move that it be referred to the Board of Directors and the Management Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the beginning of this year, university presidents signed a statement in which we guaranteed unequivocally the institutional control of all aspects of intercollegiate athletics. I firmly believe that there are a significant number of student-athletes who should be granted the unrestricted opportunity to secure employment and richly deserve to be accommodated under the terms of Proposal No. 62. Thus, I wholeheartedly agree with the speaker immediately preceding me.

However, logistics of monitoring each and every employment situation during the entire academic year for many of our institutions—up to hundreds of student-athletes will not be employed on our respective campuses—boggles the mind. Our principal dilemma is this. On the one hand, there are many, many student-athletes who have truly urgent needs for income to defray the cost of their education. On the other hand, many student-athletes have full scholarships that cover all of their tuition and fees, all room and board expenses, all text books, and in emergency situations, trips home

and dental expenses, to say nothing about additional moneys that can be received from the Pell Grants.

Proposal 62 stipulates that student-athletes be allowed to have earnings to "cover the cost of attendance." For full scholarship athletes who have additional earnings, we will not know with absolute certainty if the total package of full scholarship plus earnings does not exceed the actual cost of attendance until after the end of the academic year. Thus, we run the risk of unwittingly approving a situation that will subsequently prove to be an NCAA violation.

For these and other reasons too numerous to mention here, I move that Proposal 62, as amended, be referred to the Board of Directors and the Management Council for further clarification so that truly needy student-athletes can and will be accommodated in the context of institutional control. Thank you.

Mr. Sweazy: Excuse me, President Sorensen. It is unclear. Did you wish to refer the entire proposal or just Part A or just Part B?

Mr. Sorensen: I yield to the advice of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. Sweazy: You can do whatever you wish. It appears that you are trying to refer the entire proposal.

Mr. Sorensen: All right, sir. I will agree to that.

Mr. Sweazy: I remind the speakers that we are speaking only now on the motion to refer.

William E. Kirwan (University of Maryland, College Park): I am the chair of the Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism. I would urge the Convention not to support referral. This is a matter that has been before us on a number of occasions. This is a refinement of previous proposals. I would remind the delegates that it would be referred to the Board of Directors, almost all of whom sit on the Presidents Commission, and it has endorsed this recommendation. Thank you.

Ms. Niland: Again, in response to the previous speaker's motion to refer, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly opposes that this proposal be referred.

I would like to address a couple of the points the previous speaker made. First of all, in terms of a compliance problem, as he pointed out, this does not mean that every Division I full-scholarship student-athlete would work. Obviously, it is the students who want additional work experience or have financial needs who would take advantage of this. Therefore, it will be a smaller number and less of a compliance-tracking problem. For those reasons, we feel that this is not the time to refer. As the speaker to my right pointed out, the Presidents Commission has looked at it and reported on it. It is time to deal with it now and not further avoid the issue. Thank you.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T University): I am a member of the incoming Division I Board. In support of the commentary by the two previous speakers. I would urge that we not vote for referral. Let's deal with it now.

Joseph W. Helmick (Texas Christian University): The concern here focuses on the welfare of the student-athlete. It seems to me, though, there are at least two critical pieces of information that are not available to us that impinge upon whether or not this is, in fact, an advantage or a disadvantage to the student-athlete.

First, what would be the effect on the eligibility of the student-athlete under the Pell Grant program based upon the amount of money that they

earned? The second issue is the one that has already been raised. If the limit within the NCAA rules is the cost of attendance, and if we cannot know that cost until after the fact, then we may well actively encourage student-athletes into a situation that will place their eligibility at risk.

If those issues are relevant and of concern, we ought to understand them before we support something under the basis of it being an advantage to the student-athlete. I think that the motion to refer is both appropriate and represents the students' welfare concerns.

Carol Iwaoka (Big Ten Conference): A point of information. If a motion to refer is adopted, does that preclude consideration of No. 63?

Mr. Sweazy: No, it does not.

Robert T. Sheeran (Seton Hall University): On behalf of the sponsors of 63 and 64 who have already asked for withdrawal of those proposals in the spirit of compromise for 62, I would ask for defeat of the referral. The time has come to deal with this head on.

I would suggest we defeat referral and move for separation of A and B. Part A that deals with the cost of attendance has troubled us as well, which is why that was not in the original proposal. I think that it might be best dealt with by separating and defeating "A" and getting on with it. Then we can deal with the employment and the outside-playing season issues separately.

Ms. Niland: The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee would like to address the concerns of the previous speaker from TCU in regard to the Pell Grant and the window under Proposal No. 62. It is true that in being a Pell Grant recipient your window of ability to earn money for your financial needs will be smaller under 62.

However, we are well aware of the difficulty and the dire need that you need to show in order to get a Pell Grant. There are certain athletes—many of whom we are familiar—who may barely meet the qualifications for the Pell Grant. They have a greater need to work in order to supplement their income, cost of living expenses, et cetera. We strongly urge you to adopt this proposal because it includes student-athletes who are exceptional and don't receive a Pell Grant.

Noel Ragsdale (University of Southern California): A point of information. If there is an admissions officer or financial aid officer here, I believe that every institution has a number for the cost of attendance for an in-state student and an out-of-state student. I don't think that is a number that is determined at the end of the year. It may vary by institution, but for each institution, I believe there is a specific cost-of-attendance number in case someone is concerned about that. We have someone from financial aid who might be able to resolve that.

Mr. Sweazy: I am told that it can vary by students. There are transportation costs included in the cost of attendance. Depending upon how far from campus that student might live, the cost of attendance would vary.

Mr. Ragsdale: But there is a specific formula for each institution related to that. I don't think it depends on what that particular student spent, is what I am trying to say.

Martha O. Chiscon (Purdue University): Could we get a ruling on how the Pell Grant interacts with the cost of attendance?

Mr. Sweazy: Are you asking from the perspective of the financial aid group or the NCAA group?

Ms. Chiscon: Let's put it this way: We understood from an earlier inter-

pretation that the Pell Grant simply is not considered when determining the cost-of-attendance calculation. It just goes out of the picture. Student-athletes who had a full grant-in-aid and received whatever Pell Grant they were entitled to could also work under this proposal and earn the difference between the full grant-in-aid and the full cost of attendance.

Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. Sweazy: That is for the NCAA. The Pell Grant is not considered by the NCAA in financial limits reaching the cost of attendance.

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): Right now, people who are on a partial athletics grant can work and are working. And they are involved in the recruiting process. It is only the person on the full grant-in-aid who cannot work. It seems to me we are at a point—and I know that people will have to take a deep breath—but we have got to do what is right and what is perceived as right. Right now, we are in a situation that I think is very difficult to defend to the student-athlete and to the public. The thing that is troubling about where we are right now is that if we can't get over this hump, there are about 10 other humps that we are facing over the next five years that we have to get over.

We will just have to start to take a deep breath and get over the concern of inequities among and between regions of the country in terms of jobs available and a lot of other inequities that exist naturally in the environment. Not everybody is equal in this respect. It is time to call for the question and time to vote it up or down and move forward on this. I am concerned if we can't move forward on this, there are a lot of other things out there that we will be unable to move forward on to make the Association a better place to work in.

Mr. Sweazy: Mr. Delany, did you move to call for the question?

Mr. Delany: Yes.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[The motion to refer failed, 99-220-3.]

Mr. Sweazy: We are back to Proposal 62. You will recall we have divided the issue. We are going to consider Part B now. It is separate from all other components of the proposal. Part B is that portion of 62 that says: "The employment occurs outside the declared playing season in that sport." That is what we are to vote on and/or discuss now. If you are up at a microphone and wish to speak to Proposal No. 62, your comments should be relevant to whether or not the employment should occur outside of the playing season or not. We are doing this so that when we vote on the rest of 62, we will know what the membership has decided with respect to Part B.

Kyle B. Kallender (Big South Conference): I have an interpretative question.

If No. 62 passes, do employment earnings count toward the financial assistance used to meet the minimum aggregate expenses for Division I membership requirements as outlined in 20.9.1.2?

Mr. Sweazy: That has not yet been determined. That would have to be determined through the new management structure.

Lynda Tealer (Santa Clara University): Are student-athletes on work-study included in this proposal? Is their work included as on-campus employment?

Mr. Sweazy: Yes.

Ms. Tealer: So they would not be able to work during the playing season? They would do the work-study work during the playing season?

Mr. Sweazy: That is correct. In order for it to be exempt, they would be able to do it. In order for it to be exempt, a partial-grant athlete could use work-study to come up to the value of the full grant-in-aid.

A work-study is considered employment, but it is permissible for a person on a partial grant-in-aid to be employed through work-study and earn wages up to the amount of that grant-in-aid.

Ms. Tealer: Regardless of when that occurs?

Mr. Sweazy: Yes, under the current rules. All this would do, if passed, would create an exemption.

Yvonne L. Slatton (University of Iowa): I am confused by the answer that you just gave. Could you clarify that one more time? What would this proposal do that is different from current bylaws with regard to students on partial aid who are working during the season as well as off season? What does this proposal do?

Mr. Sweazy: Are you asking with respect to work-study now?

Ms. Slatton: Yes. Actually, any work.

Mr. Sweazy: The earnings are not exempt if the work occurs up to the limits of the financial aid. But if you vote "no" on B, employment could occur inside the declared playing season.

If you vote "yes" on B, the employment must occur outside the declared playing season. That is only in regard to exempting the earnings.

Does that clarify the issue, Bonnie? Let me try this one more time. Current rules would allow a person on partial financial aid to work in or out of season and earn money up to the financial aid limit, up to a full program need. Part B allows a student-athlete to work out of season and earn money up to the cost of attendance. This would create an extension, to the normal extension, which is the financial aid limit.

Roy Kramer (Southeastern Conference): Bob, I think what we are attempting to say, it affects in no way the individual who is on a partial scholarship who may at the present time work up to the cost of a full scholarship—not the cost of attendance, but a full scholarship as defined by the NCAA. An individual may do so during the season.

What this does, it would say that you could do in addition to that, if you passed this out of season, gain full employment, which permits you earnings up to the cost of attendance, which is significantly greater than the cost of a scholarship. Is that not correct?

Mr. Sweazy: That is correct. That is right. Now, is there still confusion?

Ms. Hurlbut: Bob, I have a question. It is kind of procedural in nature. It seems there is an awful lot of questions of interpretations on this piece of legislation. Would it be possible that at our next 10-minute break for the Council to discuss and rule on these interpretative issues so the membership knows what it is doing in this regard?

Mr. Sweazy: What interpretative issue are you making reference to?

Ms. Hurlbut: Bob, all the questions you can't answer.

Mr. Sweazy: You are out of order. (Laughter) We can answer this question. What question would you like an answer to?

Mr. Ensor: Bob, at the Council meeting prior to the Convention, there was no discussion about how this proposal would impact the membership requirement of Bylaw 20. That issue alone may really sway quite a few votes. I am very concerned that in your interpretation earlier, you referred to the fact that it will be governed under the new restructured governance rather than at the post-Convention Council meeting.

I would request, as Connie did, that perhaps it is time for a recess to allow the Division I Steering Committee to convene and review a number of these issues so that we give the membership guidance on this very important issue that affects our student-athletes. Thank you.

Mr. Sweazy: The Bylaw 20 aspects of this, as was stated earlier, have not been determined and must be determined at a later date. We cannot call a Division I Steering Committee or finance meeting in the middle of a legislative session.

We would have to have a motion to refer, at which time the Council could consider this and provide an interpretation at its post-Convention meeting. We have to have a motion to refer the proposal. It would be a motion to refer that question about the Bylaw 20 provisions.

Mr. Ensor: Bob, I have a number of questions how this would affect Proposal No. 20 since it is not referenced in this proposal at all. We don't have to be all-interpretive. I think it really does require a motion to recess for 10 minutes to at least allow the membership to convene informally to discuss this issue. I would so move.

Mr. Sweazy: Rich, I am assuming your motion is just to postpone consideration of this proposal for 15 minutes.

Mr. Ensor: That is acceptable. Thank you.

Mr. Sweazy: But you have to understand that the Council will not come back at the end of that 15 minutes with an interpretation of Bylaw 20 applications.

Mr. Ensor: That's understood.

Mr. Sweazy: But it will give the membership time to do whatever. The motion to postpone is debatable. Are you ready to vote? Those who wish to postpone debate on this proposal for 15 minutes, please raise your paddles. Thank you. Those who do not wish to postpone, please raise your paddles. The motion passes. Therefore, this will be our mandated afternoon break.

We have got a problem here, folks. We reconvene the full Convention in 20 minutes. Therefore, please go ahead and take your break now, but be prepared to reconvene at 4 o'clock in the regular business session.

[The Division I business session meeting was recessed at 3:40 p.m.]

Tuesday Morning, January 14, 1997

The Division I business session was called to order at 9 a.m., with Division I Vice-President Robert Sweazy, Texas Tech University, presiding.

Mr. Sweazy: Ladies and gentlemen, we are ready to complete the Division I agenda for this Convention. That agenda appears on Page 8 of the Convention Program. We will complete our legislative action and then open the floor for discussion of any other legislation of interest or any other topic of interest.

With that, we are ready to begin with Proposal No. 86.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Permissible Expenses—Spouse/Children of Student-Athletes

Carol J. Sprague (University of Pittsburgh): I am a member of the NCAA Council. On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 86.

The Executive Committee has spent the last two years exploring options for increasing benefits.

Mr. Sweazy: Excuse me, Carol. There is an amendment-to-amendment

that we need to move first. I also need to inform the delegates that there is a Council interpretation on Proposal 86. It is on the blue sheets that were given to you yesterday.

Ms. Sprague: On behalf of the steering committee, I would like to move Proposal 86-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, NCAA rules permit institutions to pay expenses for the spouse and children of student-athletes eligible to participate in postseason football games. In an effort to make benefits related to championship events equitable among student-athletes in all sports, Proposal 86 would permit Division I institutions to provide expenses for the spouse of children of student-athletes who participate in any NCAA championship.

This proposal, which is an amendment to No. 86, limits the provision of the expenses for the spouse and children to only one round, conducted at one site, on any NCAA championship. This proposal addresses equity concerns caused by the varying weights or number of rounds that exist among the different championships. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of 86-1.

M. Terry Holland (University of Virginia): I am chair of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee. On behalf of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, I also urge you to approve Proposal No. 86-1.

Approval of this legislation is consistent with and representative of the Association's efforts to increase benefits for student-athletes. This is permissible legislation and allows institutions to provide consistent benefits to all student-athletes. Thank you for your consideration of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 86-1 (Page A-157) was adopted.]

Charles S. Harris (Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, I support the adoption of Proposal No. 86.

This proposal is fair and will allow institutions to provide all student-athletes with the same benefit that has been available to football student-athletes. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 86 (Page A-157) was adopted as amended by No. 86-1.]

Financial Aid—Outside Educational Grant

Adam Brick (Georgetown University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would eliminate the athletics department's need to monitor student-athletes' receipt of outside awards that have no relationship to a student-athlete's athletics ability. These are awards given to the student-athletes for the intended purpose of assisting them with the escalating costs of attending college. Typically, these are community-based awards that are donated by religious, civic or nonathletics cultural organizations from the student-athlete's hometown. These organizations are not booster organizations of a member institution.

Current legislation precludes the donor of the award from being a representative of an institution's athletics interests or a booster group and also from restricting the recipient's choice of institution. This proposal does not change these requirements. In this regard, adoption of this proposal will not lead to abuses by zealous booster groups. Most student-athletes are not aware that they need to inform their institution's financial aid office or ath-

letics department that they have received such an award; thus, these awards are typically discovered after the institution could have adjusted the student-athlete's financial aid for that year.

By adopting this proposal, an institution's financial aid departments will still be required to monitor these awards consistent with the federal financial regulations. However, if student-athletes exceed their cost of attendance due to the receipt of one of these outside educational grants, then it would not be considered an NCAA violation with eligibility ramifications. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 88 (Page A-159) was defeated.]

Pass-Fail Grades

David B. Knight (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): I am a member of the Academic Requirements Committee. On behalf of the committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, courses that are graded on a pass-fail basis may not be used to satisfy core-curriculum requirements. This proposal would permit the use of individual core courses graded on a pass-fail basis for purposes of satisfying the core-curriculum requirements, with the understanding that the clearinghouse will assign the course the lowest passing grade at the high school, which in some instances may be a grade as low as "D".

This proposal will give students an opportunity to use courses to meet the initial-eligibility requirements that otherwise meet the definition of a core course but are graded on a pass-fail basis. Further, the requirement that the clearinghouse will assign the lowest passing grade will ensure that such courses will not be used to circumvent the minimum core-curriculum grade-point average standards. The committee urges your support and requests that you vote in favor of Proposal No. 90.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I have a point of caution. I think we all agree it is important that pass-fail grades need to be included. But I would hope that if adopted, the Academic Requirements Committee would also look at the possibility that students who are graded pass-fail also may achieve more than the minimum passing grade. This is written specifically so that these grades shall be assigned a grade of "D". A number of these courses with a grade of "D" is not going to help you establish yourself as a qualifier. In the new structure, the Academic Requirements Committee also should look to accommodate special situations in which the student is graded on pass-fail and actually has achieved what will be considered core-level equivalent performance. Thank you.

Robert J. Frank (Oregon State University): I have a question about the previous speaker's remarks. Does it, in fact, say that the clearinghouse shall assign a grade of "D"? My understanding is it shall assign the course the lowest passing grade of that school, which could be "B", "C", "D", whatever.

Mr. Sweazy: That is accurate.

Mr. Frank: What?

Mr. Sweazy: Your interpretation.

Mr. Frank: Oh. Thank you.

James M. Douglas (Texas Southern University): I am new to this. This seems to be one of those "nonsensibles." I don't know of any high school in the country that does not have anything other than a "D" as the lowest passing grade. We can sit here and say the lowest passing grade might be high-

er than a "D." I don't know of any high school that has a grade lower than a "D." I think we have gone overboard in trying to regulate what happens in the high schools. In any academic environment, a "P" is a nongraded course. I think we ought to exclude the grade of "pass" in calculating the average, even in the courses.

We have gone too far in trying to regulate athletes. This just doesn't make any sense. I am trying to control myself, because I sat through a lot of this yesterday. For a person who is new to this whole endeavor, I think that the athletes would be ashamed of us if they had been here yesterday, if they were here today and if they knew how we were trying to regulate them. We said we want them to be student-athletes. Then we want to treat them unlike other students. Now, if the high school has decided that a core course is a pass-fail course, then we ought to treat them like a pass-fail course. We ought not at the NCAA say if the high school says it is a pass-fail course, then it is a "D."

No, it is an ungraded course. I think that is the way it should be treated. I think everybody in here who has got sense ought to vote "no" on this.

Mr. Sweazy: Thank you. I wish I could tell you it will get better in this meeting, but I can't.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): I would just like to note that this is indeed permissive legislation. In fact, our existing bylaws do not permit us to use pass-fail courses for the purpose of establishing initial eligibility.

It was the intent of the Academic Requirements Committee to allow pass-fail courses to be used to meet the 13-core course requirement, but not to allow pass-fail courses to impact the GPA. So, in fact, if we allow the pass-fail courses to meet the core course of English or whatever, we may have young men and women who have a 3.50 who have 12 core courses and have taken another course as a pass-fail course. This legislation will allow us to count that as the 13th course. In fact, even if we assign the lowest passing grade, which I think is consistent with the concept of a pass-fail course, many of these students who are taking pass-fail courses in their junior and senior year will still be able to meet the initial-eligibility standard even if the lowest passing grade at the high school is assigned as the grade for the pass-fail course.

I encourage the delegates to pass this legislation. It is consistent with our attempt to try to be as fair as possible in allowing students to meet the initial-eligibility standards. Thank you.

Yvonne L. Slatton (University of Iowa): I would like clarification from the last speaker. I know that the purpose of this proposal is to allow us to count these courses. Why do we have to assign a letter grade to them? Why can't we just accept the hours? Jerry, could you answer that? I am wondering why they didn't consider some of the alternatives in assigning a "D".

Mr. Kingston: This is a committee recommendation. I am not sure I am the one who now should be speaking on behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee. My own personal view is that this was at least the first attempt to allow us to be able to use pass-fail courses.

It is agreed that another alternative would be to change our legislation to say you can base the GPA on eight core courses that are graded if you are then allowed to take five pass-fail courses to fill the requirement. We felt that at the time I was on the committee, and I want to make that clear, we felt that was probably going too far.

We felt this was a reasonable first step—to allow pass-fail courses to be used to meet the core-curriculum requirement—because at the present time none of that can be done. We do not want to encourage students to meet the core with ungraded work, but in the event that there is an ungraded class or just a pass-fail course, we felt this was the most appropriate approach to take.

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): I am a member of the Academic Requirements Committee. Jerry's interpretation was correct. [Proposal No. 90 (Page A-161) was adopted.]

Initial Eligibility—Core-Curriculum Requirements—Students With Disabilities

Cliff Gillespie (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal clarifies that the Academic Requirements Committee, as opposed to the high school, has final authority to determine whether high-school courses for students with disabilities are core courses.

Over the next several months, high schools will be asked to provide information on a worksheet for the courses that are offered at the high school for students with disabilities. The worksheets ask the high school to state whether students enrolled in such courses are expected to acquire the same knowledge, quantitatively and qualitatively, as students in similar courses offered by the high school. The worksheet also will ask the high school to provide information on the test used in the specific accommodations that differentiate between these courses and courses taken by students without disabilities. This proposal clarifies that while the high-school principal will be asked to provide the required documentation on the work sheet, it is the Academic Requirements Committee that ultimately makes the final determination as to whether the course should be accepted as a core course.

The Academic Requirements Committee urges your support and requests your vote in favor of Proposal No. 91, which was approved yesterday in Division II.

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-161) was adopted.]

Initial Eligibility—Core-Curriculum Time Limitation

Thomas W. Adair (Texas A&M University, College Station): I'm a member of the Academic Requirements Committee. On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit Division I prospective student-athletes with learning disabilities to use all core courses completed prior to their initial full-time collegiate enrollment to meet the initial-eligibility requirements.

Currently in Division I, all prospective student-athletes, including students with learning disabilities, must complete all core courses by the end of the student's eighth semester of high school. Any courses taken subsequent to the eighth semester may not be used to meet the initial-eligibility requirements unless the student repeats the term or terms during the academic year of high school from which he or she graduated. During meetings with the U.S. Department of Justice, issues related to the Association's accommodations for students with learning disabilities were discussed in relation to the Americans with Disabilities Act. As a result, the Association

was encouraged to consider additional accommodations in evaluating that students with learning disabilities have satisfied initial-eligibility requirements.

The Academic Requirements Committee believes this is an appropriate accommodation. Therefore, the committee urges support and requests you vote in favor of Proposal No. 92.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-162) was adopted.]

Initial Eligibility—Early Admissions Program Waiver

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): As a member of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal permits a student to receive an automatic waiver of initial-eligibility requirements if the student is admitted to an institution through the early-admissions program, even if the student has not completed four years of English. Currently, a student admitted through the early-admissions program must meet all initial-eligibility requirements, except graduation from high school, in order to be eligible. This requires a student to complete four years of English in less than four years of high-school enrollment.

This issue is the result of a change in the English requirement, which specifies that a student entering a Division I institution must have completed four years of English. The early-admissions program predates the change in the English standard. This proposal will ensure that academically gifted students have an opportunity to qualify for an early-admission waiver. The committee urges your support and requests that you vote in favor of Proposal No. 93.

[Proposal No. 93 (Page A-163) was adopted.]

Eligibility—Practice Opportunities for Olympics

Robert A. Bowlsby (University of Iowa): On behalf of the Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I move Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal originated from a task force of the U.S. Olympic Committee and the NCAA, cochaired by Ced Dempsey and George Steinbrenner. The proposal extends the new practice opportunity for potential Olympians that was established at last year's Convention. Currently, a former student-athlete or a student-athlete who is not enrolled on a full-time basis, is permitted in certain sports to participate in practice activities at the institution under certain circumstances and certain conditions. Proposal No. 95 would allow such a practice opportunity for former student-athletes at any institution the individual currently attends or previously attended as a graduate student.

Access to facilities is extremely important in advancing Olympic development. The Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believe this proposal represents a goodwill gesture to the Olympic movement without potential for abuse. I urge the delegation's support of Proposal No. 95.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-165) was adopted.]

Eligibility—Hardship Waiver

David V. Thompson (Atlantic Coast Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 142.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is the first in a series of proposals that the Legislative Review Committee recommended to the Council for deregulation or simplification. In sports that are subject to date-of-competition limitations, such as track and field and golf, there exists some confusion as to whether the percentage calculations for purposes of meeting the hardship waiver should be based on completed dates of competition.

In the current NCAA legislation, the phrase "completed events" refers to completed varsity contests in all sports. Thus, in the sports subject to date-of-competition limitations, a student-athlete who participates in three contests on a single day uses one date of competition for purposes of Bylaw 17, but has participated in three completed events for applying the hardship waiver in Bylaw 14.

Adoption of this proposal would permit the percentage calculation for hardship waivers in those sports that use dates of competition based on the institution's number of completed dates of competition as opposed to completed varsity events. The hardship waiver calculation of Bylaw 14 would now be consistent with how dates of competition are calculated in Bylaw 14. We respectfully urge your support.

[Proposal No. 142 (Page A-224) was adopted.]

Outside Competition—Division I Soccer and Women's Volleyball

Dutch Baughman (Oregon State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

The sports of soccer and women's volleyball are traditional fall season sports. While there are many late spring leagues available for soccer and women's volleyball, student-athletes attending late-quarter academic calendar schools are precluded from participation in those leagues.

This legislation would allow student-athletes at the late-quarter academic calendar schools to participate in those same leagues with the student-athletes from semester schools with certain conditions being met, which would include approval by the athletics director and the provision that there would be no missed class time. We urge your adoption of this proposal.

Mary Ellen Cloninger (Utah State University): As a member of the NCAA Olympic Sports Committee, I rise to vote in favor of Proposal No. 96. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee over the last couple of years has discussed the issues of outside competition for Division I student-athletes during the off season.

The committee has heard concerns from a number of governing national Olympic bodies, particularly soccer and volleyball, that current restrictions preclude many of our student-athletes from taking advantage of some of the developmental opportunities that are available outside of the traditional and nontraditional seasons.

We believe this will help to improve their athletics skills by participation on outside teams without infringing too greatly upon the time they spend outside their sport. The committee has also noted that Division II has operated under a similar rule change for the past three years, and the committee is unaware of why there are problems that have been created as a result. On behalf of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal No. 96.

[Proposal No. 96 (Page A-166) was adopted.]

De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

Robert J. Baugh (Eastern Kentucky University): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 98. I think it is only appropriate to vote on B, C, D, E, F, G and J at this time. Is that right, Robert?

Mr. Sweazy: That is correct. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

These types of violations do not result in a benefit being provided to the prospect or student-athlete. An institution seldom gains a recruiting or competitive advantage. It is important to note, however, that all violations of NCAA rules, including those included in this proposal, must be reported to the NCAA enforcement staff.

One or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed on the institution and institutional employees. The only difference is that the eligibility of a prospect or student-athlete will not be affected. The Eligibility Committee believes that the proposal is effective and a positive step against the violation of a prospective student-athlete's eligibility. The Eligibility Committee supports this proposal and we strongly urge that you do also.

Norman Chervany (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I would first ask to separate Item J from B, C, D, E, F and G of Proposal No. 96.

Mr. Sweazy: That is granted.

Mr. Chervany: Speaking now with respect to Parts B through G, while we appreciate the efforts of deregulation, the adverse effects of Parts B through G are potentially too dramatic to warrant consideration.

These de minimis violations, if adopted, would create opportunities for coaches to make conscious decisions for recruitment of prospects without having to worry about the eligibility consequences associated with such actions. The only place within the recruiting legislation where a violation is considered de minimis are those surrounding an official visit that is canceled or involves inclement weather. The de minimis violations in Parts B through G of Proposal No. 98 would open doors that this Association has previously closed in the recruiting process. The opening of these doors is not wise. We urge you to defeat Parts B, C, D, E, F and G of Proposal No. 98. Thank you.

Susan E. Glatter (University of Texas at El Paso): I appreciate the comments from the University of Minnesota and respect the eligibility precedents. The eligibility of these student-athletes is always restored. As a former eligibility staff person, this is not the type of thing where you are going to take away eligibility. You can punish the school but not the athlete. If we are going to go ahead and restore eligibility anyway, then let's just change the rule and not have to do the paperwork on eligibility. Let's just send it to enforcement and let the Committee on Infractions handle it. Thank you.

Mr. Sweazy: Thank you. Please note the immediate effective date on this proposal. Before we vote on the proposal itself, we must vote on the immediate effective date. It is a two-thirds majority vote required. So we are voting on whether or not to make this effective immediately.

[Parts B, C, D, E, F and G of Proposal No. 98 (Page A-169) were adopted, effective immediately.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Division I Basketball

Marcia Borys (Tennessee Technological University): I would like to move Proposal No. 101 on behalf of the Ohio Valley Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

By allowing phone calls during the 48 hours prior to the initial signing date for the national letter, a school could be updated on the prospect's plans for the scholarship so the offer could be made to another player if the recruit is not interested in your institution.

Remember, you cannot hand deliver the national letter. Many schools are mailing them early with the possibility of signing more players than national letters available. Football already has this rule. This proposal would make both sports the same for compliance.

Surveys have shown that football coaches like this rule. Having football and basketball under the same rule would simplify compliance for schools. In addition, it is believed that this rule is often violated by many schools with the "roll of quarters" from the pay phone. Coaches are allowed to call the home of the prospect as many times as they want during this period. More calls are probably made under current rules than if the rule were changed to allow the calls directly to the prospect rather than the coach. A prospect does not have to take the call if he does not want to talk with the recruiter. We would appreciate your support of Proposal No. 101.

Khalid Channel (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of California, Irvine): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and I strongly oppose Proposal No. 101. We believe that allowing college coaches to make unlimited phone calls to a recruit during a specified period would be a great disservice. It is at this time that a prospect must make an extremely important decision regarding his or her academic and athletics future. Unlimited phone calls from numerous coaches would serve only to complicate this critical decision process further. We believe it is in the best interest of the student to make a decision with his or her family and without these unnecessary, intrusive phone calls.

We understand the coaches' concern about having some knowledge of the recruit's intent in these critical hours before and after signing the National Letter of Intent. However, this should be tempered with the understanding that these undue intrusions are not in the student-athlete's best interest. It would make a difficult task even more daunting. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and myself again urge the delegates to vote in opposition to Proposal No. 101. Thank you.

Charles N. Lindemann (Montana State University-Bozeman): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the NCAA Recruiting Committee, we join the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee in opposing Proposal No. 101. The committee believes that the current exception of telephone calls permits institutions' staff members to make unlimited calls to a prospect on the initial date of signing and two days immediately following the initial date is appropriate legislation. But we believe unlimited calls of prospects 48 hours prior to the initial signing does, indeed, complicate and disrupt the prospect's decision-making process. We would ask that you defeat this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 101 (Page A-177) was defeated.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Division I Ice Hockey

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit Division I hockey institutions the opportuni-

ty to make a single telephone call to prospects—specifically those from a foreign country—during the month of July following the prospect's sophomore year in high school. The primary purpose in permitting this one call is to provide much-needed information regarding NCAA college hockey to these prospects, particularly those in Canada who even as high-school sophomores are already being recruited aggressively to play Canadian junior hockey.

It is this aggressive recruitment by these junior leagues in Canada at this early age, combined with the absence of any presence whatsoever by the college hockey community, that has seriously impacted the ability of college coaches to be successful in their recruiting efforts a year later with these same prospects. In addition, this early recruitment by Canadian junior hockey leagues has resulted in a growing number of these young players jeopardizing their future eligibility as college athletes unknowingly, even if they never played on the junior team.

It certainly can be argued that one telephone call to a college coach might not be sufficient to deter all of these young prospects from a decision favoring junior hockey, but it will at least provide an opportunity that is currently unavailable to these prospects to become more informed about NCAA college hockey, NCAA amateurism rules, and to be made aware that college hockey is a viable option. The NCAA Division I hockey conferences are well aware of the number of prospects who wish they had known at that early age in their hockey careers what their options were and how they could have avoided foreclosure on a college education at an NCAA school.

Adoption of this proposal can make a positive difference with a minimum of intrusion on the welfare of the hockey prospect. I urge your support. Thank you.

Susan E. Glatter (University of Texas at El Paso): Most people are wondering why we care about voting for this rule at all. I ask you to vote in favor of this to help me fulfill a promise to the father of Danny Del Monte.

In December 1993, he came to me at a hockey tournament I was doing in Toronto, Canada. He had signed a National Letter of Intent in November of that year with Bowling Green University. He was fulfilling his dream. His brother had played for Yale, got great grades and played college hockey, and went on to be pro potential. He came to me because he discovered he had played in a Major Junior A game. He did not know it was a Major Junior A game. He was told it was simply a practice. Canada, whether people agree or disagree, has a "club system" of hockey. The top level is Major Junior A or Major Junior. This, at best, is professional in nature.

Some people are likening it to stopping in for a cup of tea. They are not thinking that would make them part of a pro team. Some people are like Eric Lindros, who was parked down at a Major Junior A team until he could force a trade to the NHL team that he wanted. These kids are asked to play up one level. They are intentionally used in one game. They never sign a contract. The Recruiting Committee's rationale is not correct. They don't sign contracts. They play in one game. If you look at the legislation, these people have to sit and lose a season for one minute and one game. They were never pro.

If a phone call had been made at the time and if the rule had been explained to these kids—and there are numerous cases the eligibility staff has dealt with—then they would have been informed. Don't vote in favor of the thing that goes on up there with unethical people using kids. Thank you

for your consideration.

James L. Hoyt (University of Wisconsin, Madison): On behalf of all 10 members of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association, I urge support for this legislation.

We believe the legislation is in the best interest of student-athletes and of the member schools. It permits NCAA hockey coaches to provide foreign, mainly Canadian prospects, with information regarding college hockey as an option. It permits prospects to make more informed decisions before it is too late. It is mainly a Canadian issue, where youth are largely unaware of the option of playing college hockey until after they have been aggressively recruited by Canadian junior leagues, often for years.

This proposal does not solve the problem. After all, it only permits one phone call. But it does give NCAA member hockey schools a better opportunity to educate prospects about their college options before they may be precluded from pursuing a college education.

Charles N. Lindemann (Montana State University-Bozeman): I speak on behalf of the NCAA Division I Steering Committee and the Recruiting Committee.

I must speak in opposition to Proposal No. 102. The committee does not believe that one phone call could make a substantial difference in the determination of whether a prospect from a foreign country attends a collegiate institution or signs with a professional league. We believe that there are better methods and those methods should be explored.

The committee also is concerned about phoning a prospect at this early point in the prospect's high-school career. This is during his sophomore year. Therefore, we would ask that you defeat Proposal No. 102 and give careful consideration to more appropriate methods to inform the students in Canada.

Ronald E. Zwierlein (Bowling Green State University): As an executive member of the CCHA, I urge the delegates to support this particular issue. It does inform student-athletes of the information that is necessary for them to make an educated decision about attending colleges and universities in the United States.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-177) was adopted.]

Recruiting—Division I Ice Hockey

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal specifies that Division I hockey institutions will have a total of seven recruiting opportunities during the academic year, three of which may be in-person, off-campus contacts—the same as the current limits.

The adoption of this proposal merely provides greater flexibility in the recruiting process without increasing either the current limit on contacts or the current combined total limit on contacts and evaluations, a similar concept to what was adopted last year for Division I basketball. I urge the delegates' support of Proposal No. 103.

Charles N. Lindemann (Montana State University-Bozeman): The Recruiting Committee supports this proposal since the total number of contacts and evaluations will remain the same. It is consistent with the legislative application for Division I football and basketball. It has been the committee's general position to support sports-specific legislation if it is compatible with similar legislation in other sports. We urge your support. Thank

you.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-178) was adopted.]

Recruiting—National Letter of Intent

Bill Byrne (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the delegates know, currently when coaches makes a home visit, they are allowed to explain the National Letter of Intent, but they are not allowed to leave it with the prospect. Instead, they leave, turn around and mail or Fed Ex it back to the prospect.

This legislation allows the coach to leave the National Letter of Intent after having explained it to the prospect. The Recruiting Committee supports this. We hope you will, too.

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 104.

Allowing in-person, off-campus delivery of a National Letter of Intent by coaching staff members to put additional pressure on prospective student-athletes at a time when they face a very difficult decision is unnecessary. Further, coaches will feel that in order to assure competitive equity in the recruiting process, it will be necessary to use one of the permissible contacts to deliver the National Letter of Intent in person. Therefore, on behalf of the Division I Steering Committee, I urge you to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

David T. Braine (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University): I rise in support of this proposition for two reasons. Number one, it is common sense. Number two, it is a cost savings. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 104 (Page A-180) was adopted.]

Printed Recruiting Materials—Student-Athlete Handbook— Divisions I and II

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): I move Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, we are not required to send student handbooks to students who are going to enroll in our institutions. They are allowed to pick them up when they are on campus for a paid visit or an unofficial visit. Anyone who accesses your campus in person is permitted to have one; everyone else is not.

This legislation permits you to send a handbook to a student-athlete who has signed a letter of intent at your institution so you can keep him or her up to date instead of sending pieces of information that is contained in the handbook itself. We urge your support of this motion.

Charles N. Lindemann (Montana State University-Bozeman): The Recruiting Committee supports this proposal. Consistent with its general belief that recruiting legislation should be less restrictive after a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent, the committee believes it is reasonable to permit institutions to send handbooks to prospects. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-184) was adopted.]

Academic Credentials for Official Visit Prior To Early Signing Period

Thomas W. Adair III (Texas A&M University, College Station): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal

No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal eliminates the academic requirements that prospective student-athletes must achieve before being permitted to take an official visit to an institution before the early signing period. However, this retains the requirements that must be met for taking an official visit at any other time. The committee believes the earlier official visit legislation may be problematic for students with learning disabilities, especially those who have not yet obtained "recruited" status. The committee believes it no longer is appropriate to require separate, official visiting standards for those sports with early signing periods.

[Proposal No. 108 (Page A-185) was adopted.]

Official Visit—Transportation

Walter Nadzak (The Citadel): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 109 attempts to refine legislation that was passed several years ago that has created additional expense for all of our institutions. We believe that No. 109 is good legislation. It allows an institution to provide transportation by automobile on an official visit, but prevents an institution from abusing the process by requiring that the 48-hour period begin with the initiation of the transportation and ends when the prospect is returned home. It eliminates state boundaries as a restriction. It eliminates miles as a restriction, but instead leaves the restriction to the discretion of the institution, but always within the 48-hour visit. We think this is common sense legislation and urge your support.

Debbie Richardson (Appalachian State University): I urge the delegates to support Proposal No. 109. During the just completed basketball recruiting period at Appalachian State, we incurred a major cost and inconvenience to a prospect because of our current rule. Number 109 is an attempt to bring common sense to this provision.

Danville, Virginia, is located due north of Greensboro, North Carolina, and 20 miles into Virginia. Appalachian State, located in Boone, North Carolina, is 120 miles away. To get a prospect to visit, we would be forced to pay for a taxi ride from Danville to Greensboro. In Greensboro, he would change to a commuter airline for a 30-minute flight to Charlotte. After a delay in Charlotte, the prospect would change planes for another commuter flight to Hickory, North Carolina. The prospect then could be picked up by staff at our nearest airport and driven the 45 minutes to Boone. All this is at considerable cost and time.

By comparison, if this legislation is adopted, next year the same person would be picked up by a certified, off-campus recruiter and transported the two hours to Boone and transported home again. We believe it is a common-sense measure that saves both time and money for all of our programs. We urge your support.

[Proposal No. 109 (Page A-186) was adopted.]

Official Visits—National Service Academies—Basketball

Jack Lengyel (U.S. Naval Academy): I would like to move Proposal No. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

Congressional procedures require that all service academies receive a

presidential or a congressional or a military appointment to be considered for admissions and we are required to consider all candidates from 50 states. The most important aspect of the service academies' recruiting is to ensure that our prospective student-athletes fully understand their military commitment of five years after graduation and their daily academic and professional military responsibilities during their four years at the academy.

Therefore, to provide the prospective student-athletes an opportunity to fully understand their obligations, we feel that it is imperative that they visit the academy. On behalf of the service academies, I want to thank you for your support of Proposal No. 111.

[Proposal No. 111 (Page A-188) was adopted.]

Unofficial Visit—Admissions Event

Constance H. Hurlbut (Patriot League): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current NCAA legislation, when admissions departments offer a meal to all students attending an open house event and a coach makes contact with a prospect attending the open house, such contact constitutes an official visit with the prospect. Students, including prospective student-athletes who attend such functions, are doing so at their own cost. Providing an exception for prospective student-athletes in all sports except football and men's and women's basketball limits potential recruiting abuses and at the same time permits prospective student-athletes to participate in normal recruiting activities. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of No. 112.

[Proposal No. 112 (Page A-189) was adopted.]

Visit Unrelated to Recruitment—National Student-Athlete Day

Charles Whitcomb (San Jose State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Minority Opportunities and Interest Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the spirit of student welfare, the purpose of this legislation is to exempt National Student-Athlete Day activities held on an institution's campus from limitations on providing entertainment to a prospect.

National Student-Athlete Day is a significant event recognizing the bringing together of athletes, prospects and collegiate student-athletes of all abilities. This proposal demonstrates the Association's commitment to encouraging athletes' participation and facilitates the promotion of issues relating to their welfare. The student-athletes should have an opportunity to participate in collegiate and national student-athlete day activities within their community. Their participation should be exempt from counting as an official visit. We encourage your support.

[Proposal No. 113 (Page A-190) was adopted.]

Tryout Exceptions—Golf and Tennis

Marcia Borys (Tennessee Technological University): I move Proposal No. 115 on behalf of the Ohio Valley Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

We feel there is presently an abuse of the rule by the majority of tennis and golf coaches. In a limited survey of regional tennis coaches, very few

knew this was a violation of the tryout rule.

This would allow for tennis and golf coaches to teach private lessons in their area without violating the tryout rule. Most golf and tennis coaches teach these lessons as part of their normal duties. It is again anticipated that most participants in these lessons will be beginning golfers with very little chance of being recruited. Golf and tennis coaches can already teach private lessons to every age group except high school. Outstanding prospects usually are playing long before high school. If a coach develops a special relationship with a prospect, it is usually at a much earlier age. This rule would legitimize an ongoing practice. We would appreciate your support of Proposal No. 115.

Christine A. Dawson (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the Pac-10 Conference, I urge you to oppose Proposition No. 115. This proposal would create a distinct and unfair recruiting advantage for those coaches giving lessons to prospects. There is no reason that tennis and golf should be allowed this exception to the tryout rule to allow extensive personal contact with prospects when that is not the case in other sports. Again, we urge you to vote against 115. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-191) was defeated.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Camps and Clinics

John A. Bove (Pennsylvania State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 144.

[The motion was seconded.]

The general principle of Bylaw 17 regarding the number of student-athletes who may be employed in an institution's camp or clinic is no longer necessary inasmuch as in all sports other than Division I football it is now permissible for an institution to employ its student-athletes in its camps or clinics. The committee notes that it remains impermissible for student-athletes to engage in organized practice activities under the guise of an institutional camp or clinic. This proposal merely deletes a principle that is no longer applicable. In the spirit of deregulation, we respectfully urge your support.

[Proposal No. 144 (Page A-227) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Divisions I and II

Melissa A. Conboy (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move for adoption of Proposal No. 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal represents a significant portion of the NCAA Council deregulation and publication package. The Legislative Review Committee spent the last year analyzing Bylaw 17. It determined that the best way to simplify would be to eliminate the distinction between traditional and nontraditional playing seasons and establish consistent dates in each sport for the start of preseason practice, the first competition or contest date and the end of the regular season.

In addition, the committee believes that establishing a playing season based on a consistent number of days would greatly simplify Bylaw 17. It is important to note that institutions will continue to be provided the opportunity to conduct two distinct consecutive-day segments with the majority of their practice competition opportunities taking place in the segments in

which the NCAA championship in that sport occurs. In sports in which the NCAA championships occur in the fall term, the date for the start of practice and competition would be consistent with the date that currently exists for the traditional segment. In sports in which the NCAA championship does not occur during the fall, the dates of beginning preseason practice and competition would be consistent with the date that currently exists for the nontraditional segment.

The committee realizes that a number of institutions may wish to begin their season earlier than the prescribed days because of climactic conditions or because there is not a significant emphasis on participation in national championship competition in that sport. The committee believes those schools may seek relief from the Administrative Review Panel in such cases. The adoption of this proposal will eliminate a significant number of pages from Bylaw 17 and simplify the process by which institutions declare practice seasons. The committee emphasizes that this proposal is designed primarily to simplify and does not substantively modify the method by which institutions compute their playing season. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 145 (Page A-228) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Preseason Practice— Division I Basketball

Dutch Baughman (Oregon State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 118 will establish the starting date for preseason basketball practice to be the Saturday closest to October 15. At the present time, our legislation allows practice to begin on the 15th. It has been found that many schools across the country attempt to have some kind of promotional activity in conjunction with the beginning of the first day of practice. That typically leads to missed class time. This proposal would allow the first day of practice to be on a Saturday, whereby the evening activities prior to that practice would not impinge on classroom opportunities. We urge the adoption of this proposal.

James Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): On this particular proposal, in all due respect to the promotional support, we oppose the passage of No. 118. October 15 is the starting day and has been identified. Promotional activities could be set up for the weekend that would not affect the students attending classes. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-195) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Season—First Contest Date—Division I Basketball

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal provides an additional week to permit greater flexibility in the scheduling of Division I men's basketball games. This does not expand the overall playing and practice season or increase the number of games. It merely provides more time to play those games. This means that institutions can elect not to schedule games during final examination, reading weeks and/or vacations and still play a full schedule without having to play a compressed schedule after the first of the year. I urge you to join the Council in supporting this proposal.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-196) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—First Contest Date— Division I Women's Basketball

Arthur W. Cooper (North Carolina State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the other sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a companion piece to 119. This proposal provides the same flexibility for the scheduling of women's basketball that we just addressed in men's basketball. The arguments for 119, therefore, hold to No. 120.

Moreover, in women's basketball, with greater latitude in scheduling, it would even be more important than for men's programs. Some conferences have elected to conduct their women's tournaments a week in advance of the men's tournaments so those interested in the programs can see both the men's and women's contests. This will cause those institutions that want to play a full, regular-season schedule of games to play more games during a single week, which can increase the time away from campus and potentially missed classes.

Again, this proposal does not expand the overall playing and practice season. It does not increase the maximum number of contests for women's basketball. I urge you to join the Council in supporting this proposal.

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-197) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—First Contest Date— Division I Basketball

J. Douglas Elgin (Missouri Valley Conference): On behalf of the 10 members of the Missouri Valley Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 121.

[The motion was seconded.]

The University of Alaska Fairbanks has initiated and sponsored the Top of the World Classic for many of the same reasons that the University of Alaska Anchorage has conducted the Great Alaska Shootout. Primarily, it is a means to attract and maintain a competitive basketball schedule.

Proposal No. 121 provides equitable application of the existing calendar exemption. Alaska Anchorage is one of the most isolated NCAA member institutions. The nearest opponent is 1,500 miles away. The proposal is supported by the Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons, and I urge your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 121 (Page A-198) was adopted.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Women's Lacrosse—Division I

Kathleen Hallock (Colonial Athletic Association): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will allow institutions to provide the same opportunities during the nontraditional segments in women's lacrosse that currently apply in the sports of field hockey and soccer. We urge your support of Proposal No. 126. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 126 (Page A-207) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Out-of-Season Practice—Basketball

David V. Thompson (Atlantic Coast Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 147.

[The motion was seconded.]

Legislation that permits members of an institution's basketball team to participate in a wheelchair basketball game following the close of the regular season is rarely invoked and, therefore, the committee believes that such legislation is unnecessary. An institution that wishes to participate in such a contest may request a waiver of the prohibition against out-of-season athletically related activities from the Administrative Review Panel. Elimination of this subsection would also help reduce the length of Bylaw 17. In the spirit of deregulation, we urge your support.

[Proposal No. 147 (Page A-233) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Outside Competition—Basketball

John A. Bove (Pennsylvania State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

The committee recognizes the amount of paperwork with which the membership is faced and sees this piece of legislation as an opportunity to decrease that amount. The adoption of this proposal would eliminate the requirement that the NCAA Council must approve participation of sanctioning outside-team tours in the sport of basketball. Such tours would be sanctioned only on an institutional basis in accordance with Bylaw 30.7 and only if more than two of an institution's basketball student-athletes participated. We respectfully urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 149 (Page A-235) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Outside Teams—Water Polo

Bill Shumard (Long Beach State University): On behalf of its sponsors, I would like to move Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

We believe the current legislation limits the growth of the sport of water polo, which is emerging on the women's side and making a turnaround on the men's side. It destroys the recruitment of the hometown athlete and reduces the opportunity for an institution to attract part-time staff who need the additional income during the summer months.

The proposed amendment will help solve this problem without adding any financial burden on the institutions involved while giving the student-athletes the opportunity to choose where they would compete during the summer. We would urge your support on this.

Kaia Hendlund (University of Hawaii, Manoa): I am chair of the NCAA Men's Water Polo Committee. Water polo is a facility-constraint sport. Student-athletes do not have the advantages as those in other sports. Very few opportunities are available for coaches and players to be involved with this sport in the summer months.

This proposal creates no budget impact and no opportunity for abuse. With the men's program trying to maintain and grow in numbers and the women's program having been designated an emerging sport, this legislation is vital to the long-term health of the sport on the collegiate level for men and women. I urge you to support Proposal No. 128.

Nelson E. Townsend (State University of New York at Buffalo): I rise as a member of the NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee to encourage your support of Proposal No. 128. The committee believes strongly that this proposal can assist in the growth of water polo and also stop a decline in the

number of schools and student-athletes participating in the sport at the college level.

The water polo situation is unique because of the scarcity of facilities, coaches, players and competitive opportunities, as well as the struggle to maintain sufficient sponsorship for an NCAA championship. A sport under these circumstances should be given every chance to boost its status in the collegiate environment so that more significant measures will not be taken in the future.

On behalf of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I ask you not to let this opportunity pass to create more developmental opportunities for student-athletes. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-208) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons— Divisions I and II Extraordinary Personnel Losses

John A. Bove (Pennsylvania State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move Proposal No. 146.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over the course of the past year, the committee's deregulation efforts have focused on Bylaw 17. Part of that focus has been on reducing the length of the bylaw. This proposal, if adopted, would remove a section from many of the 27 sports within the bylaw. In addition, the committee notes that the legislation governing waivers based on extraordinary personnel losses appear inconsistently throughout Bylaw 17. In other words, the legislation appears in some sports and not in others, and is currently available in some divisions and not others. Under current NCAA legislation, waivers for extraordinary personnel losses must be approved by the NCAA Council.

The committee believes that the Administrative Review Panel is the appropriate avenue to seek relief of the application of playing- and practice-season legislation when such extraordinary personnel losses would occur. In the past, such approval would be a mere formality. Along with the Council, we respectfully urge your support.

[Proposal No. 146 (Page A-233) was adopted.]

Resolution: Division I Baseball and Softball

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Ohio State University): On behalf of the Big Ten Conference, I move Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 129 is a resolution concerning the sports of baseball and softball. The resolution would establish a special committee representative of academic, competitive and financial concerns to explore the possibility of redefining the competitive seasons for baseball and softball by moving the championships for these sports to late June. The resolution calls for a report to the appropriate committees within a year with legislation to accomplish this end.

Baseball and softball in the north consists of February travel into warmer climates, all away games, all long trips. March brings spring mud and a trip to the South. April brings a log-jam of games, rainy-day makeups and incredible pressure on the student-athletes who participate in the two sports. Because of climate situations, it is difficult to develop a base support in revenue that can come along with that fan support. Access to the NCAA championships for northern schools is very difficult. The RPI, which is used by the committees to select teams at large, is low for our schools because we

play so many games early in the season at disadvantaged situations.

Regional hosting opportunities are virtually nil in connection with the NCAA tournaments for our programs. Baseball and softball are national games and the NCAA should administer them on a national basis. This is a study issue to proactively examine these games and to make recommendations on the future of these sports. I urge adoption of Resolution No. 129.

Edward Leland (Stanford University): I rise in opposition to this proposal. I think that it is a serious mistake to move the baseball and softball seasons out of their traditional seasons. I think it is a mistake to study it.

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I move that we refer this proposal to the Championships Committee of the new governance structure so that the study can be conducted within that system and have checks and balances between the subdivisions. Thank you.

[The motion to refer was seconded.]

Mr. Geiger: I assume that if it is referred that means it will be studied and we can move the proposal on to the table for discussion at some level there. Is that correct?

Mr. Sweazy: That is correct.

Mr. Geiger: This is not an effort to kill it?

Mr. Sweazy: I can't speak to the sponsor's intent. Rich, would you like to answer that question?

Mr. Ensor: This is only an effort to have it studied within the context of the new system rather than set up a special committee.

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Andy, you have proposed solely to extend the season to late June. Would you concur that this committee could decide on all options, including perhaps moving softball and baseball to the fall?

Mr. Geiger: I would assume that they would not be constrained by this particular language, Alan.

Mr. Sweazy: Okay. We are ready on the motion to refer.

[Resolution No. 129 (Page A-209) was referred to the Division I Championships/Competition Cabinet.]

Athletically Related Income—Equipment and Apparel Contracts

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): I would like to move Proposal No. 131.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to make a motion to refer it to the governance structure.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): I would like to ask Jim as the sponsor of the original motion, since it has Council support, if he has a particular reason for wanting to delay action and refer it.

Mr. Delany: Yes.

Mr. Sweazy: I am sorry, Jeff, it does not have Council support.

Mr. Orleans: It does not?

Mr. Sweazy: No, it does not. Any other discussion on the motion to refer? Jim has got a plane to catch.

[Proposal No. 131 (Page A-211) was referred to the Division I Business/Finance Cabinet.]

Conduct and Employment of Athletics Personnel

Charles N. Lindemann (Montana State University-Bozeman): On behalf of the NCAA Recruiting Committee and Council, I move adoption of Proposal

No. 132.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal prohibits an institutional coaching staff member from promoting a noninstitutional camp or clinic that does not employ that coach. Consistent with the Recruiting Committee's general belief, this legislation attempts to further prohibit an NCAA coaching or other department staff member from being involved in non-institutional camps. We would urge your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 132 (Page A-212) was adopted.]

Scouting of Opponents—Division I Women's Volleyball

Dennis A. Farrell (Big West Conference): On behalf of the sponsors and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 133. Off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents in the sport of women's volleyball is a costly matter for institutions not in metropolitan areas. Prohibiting the scouting of opponents in women's volleyball would not only result in significant cost savings for most institutions, but it also would create a level playing field for all institutions. The scouting of women's volleyball opponents would now occur only through videotape exchange. On behalf of the Council and the sponsors, I urge your support of Proposal No. 133.

[Proposal No. 133 (Page A-212) was adopted.]

Transfer—Positive Drug Test

Dennis Wilson (Auburn University): As chair of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, I would like to move Proposal No. 136.

[The motion was seconded.]

When a student-athlete tests positive in an NCAA drug test, he or she is declared ineligible for one year. This legislation would simply transmit that information of the student's ineligibility to a subsequent institution that the athlete might transfer to. I would add that the Council and the Executive Committee support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 136 (Page A-217) was adopted.]

Championships—Size of Fields/Automatic Qualification

Frank Windegger (Texas Christian University): The NCAA Executive Committee supports Proposal No. 138 and I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

I urge your adoption of this proposal. This proposal details the process of determining automatic qualifying conferences in team sports under the new structure. It basically puts in the legislative form what is already established practice in terms of rewarding at least 50 percent of the team-sport bracket to automatic qualifiers. It establishes playing systems for the remaining conferences. On behalf of the Executive Committee, we urge you to adopt Proposal No. 138.

[Proposal No. 138 (Page A-220) was adopted.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Sweazy: We have concluded all the legislation in the Division I session. Is there any other business or other issues that you wish to have discussed?

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I would just like to commend the chair for the skill and good humor with which you have guided us through our sessions. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Sweazy: Thank you. In turn, this morning you have been a very well-behaved audience and made excellent decisions. Lunch will be at 12:15 in the Tennessee Room. We stand adjourned until 1:30 when the general session will convene in this room.

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.]

■ NCAA Honors Dinner

Sunday Evening, January 12, 1997

WELCOME

President Corrigan: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the 32nd annual NCAA honors dinner program. We will begin with the invocation, which will be presented by Reverend Mona Boggasow, assistant chaplain at Vanderbilt University. After the invocation, please enjoy your dinner. Then we will be back with tonight's program.

INVOCATION

Reverend Boggasow (Vanderbilt University): Let us pray.

O holy mystery, you who are known by many names and yet still unknown; we gather this evening to honor commitment, to honor excellence, but most of all to celebrate life itself. For the challenge to see beyond ourselves, we give you thanks. For the opportunity to give breath and voice to our dreams, we give you thanks. For the strength to stand even when we stand alone, we give you thanks. Allow us to recommit ourselves to service, to vocation, to community. In our time of fellowship, give us pleasure. In our time of learning, give us energy and remind us of the comfort of friends in far places when we disburse.

Now, thank you for the bounty of the earth, for the hands which serve, and for the time to enjoy, we offer our thanks. Amen.

[Note: Dinner was served to the delegates.]

INTRODUCTIONS

President Corrigan: I realize that some of you have not completed your dinner, but we have a terrific program this evening. I know you want to get to it, so please continue to enjoy your meal while I make some preliminary remarks and introductions, after which we will present our honored guests to you.

I do have to tell you and our honorees that my participation in tonight's dinner is truly a highlight of my term as NCAA president.

The honors dinner annually permits us to reflect on the positive values of intercollegiate athletics within the mission of higher education that has been established on each of our campuses.

The current student-athletes we honor tonight represent the very best that our intercollegiate athletics programs have to offer. We salute their accomplishments. We also take tremendous pride in the successes of the former student-athletes on the dais tonight. They have become role models in the environments in which they have competed and in which they now serve.

It is these successes that provide us the encouragement and the will to continue our quest to create the best possible athletics opportunities for students in future generations. The individuals whom we salute tonight represent the countless student-athletes who combine intellectual and physical abilities to epitomize the student-athlete model. As I look down the dais tonight, to the young people on this side, and the "old timers" on this side, I can't help but feel proud of the past and confident of the future.

At this time, I would like to recognize some of the individuals sharing the dais tonight. First, the chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, which is responsible for selecting our honorees and planning our program, is the director of athlet-

ics at the University of Washington and the outstanding president of NACDA, Barbara Hedges. (Applause)

I cannot say enough about this next person. Our secretary-treasurer has represented intercollegiate athletics with considerable style for many years, the last 15 as the assistant commissioner of the Big Ten Conference. Many of you may know that she is retiring at the end of June, so let's show this woman how much we appreciate her many contributions. Ladies and gentlemen, Phyllis Howlett. (Applause)

This fellow was a student-athlete, he was a coach and he even served for a time as dean of students, always with distinction, our Executive Director, Ced Dempsey. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Now, the honorees on tonight's dais are likely to impress our master of ceremonies, but he probably won't be intimidated. You see, for years he has begun his morning by interviewing the likes of Sidney Poitier, Tom Cruise and Steven Spielberg.

Mark McEwen has been a fixture in the morning on CBS since 1987, and currently serves as a coanchor of that network's "This Morning" program. The versatile University of Maryland graduate has served that show in various capacities, including weather reporter, and music and entertainment editor. He has covered the Academy Awards, the Country Music Association Awards, the Cannes Film Festival, the Golden Globe Awards and the Grammy Awards.

Mark's good humor is always evident, whether as a contributor to the CBS news magazine "48 Hours" or with CBS Sports at the Winter Olympics. But his hidden talent may be that of a designated three-point shooter. Holy mackerel, that is impressive. How many takes?

Mark McEwen: One. (Laughter)

President Corrigan: I first met Mark in the summer of 1987 when we had the International Special Olympics at Notre Dame. He came out and helped us through that. He is a great guy. He has done the Oscars, the Grammys and now, Mark, you have hit the big time, the NCAA honors dinner.

Ladies and gentlemen, one of TV's really good guys, Mark McEwen. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF TODAY'S TOP VIII

Mr. McEwen: In the words of Elvis, thank you very much. Welcome to a great night in the largest hotel I have ever seen in my life. I was looking at a lot of people in the audience tonight, and I think we qualify as a suburb of Nashville, by the way.

I do know this hotel. I covered eight musical country awards here. Coming down south from New York is always a learning experience for me. The first time I ever introduced a country band in a club I was in Mobile, Alabama, the kind of club where a lot of guys with khakis and caps hung out. I came out and I thought I would break the ice by sort of telling them where I was from. I said: "Hi, everybody. I am from New York." There was dead silence. I said: "Anybody here who has been to New York?" Dead silence. "Anybody here knows what a bagel is?" A guy in the back put up his hand. He said: "Yeah, that is a hunting dog." (Laughter)

The things you learn traveling around the country for CBS. Also, the NCAA. I am thrilled to be up here. I remember the first prime-time basketball game—UCLA and Houston—back in, what was it, 1969 I believe it was. I was four, and my mother let me stay up to watch it.

I also remember I went to West Lafayette, Indiana, back in 1987. It was the spring of '87. I was brand new, had just started at CBS. I was there to talk to all of the local sales people, about 400 or 500 people, about the new fall season at CBS. We had "Beauty and the Beast" in prime time. I thought Indiana, I am going to bond tonight. I said: "It is a pleasure to be here in Indiana. How about the fact that the national championship in basketball is back in the state of Indiana?" You could hear a pin drop. Somebody pulled me aside and said: "That is Indiana. This is Purdue."

The things you learn traveling around the country. I am an ACC boy. The University of Maryland, 13-1. Vince Dooley reminded me that Georgia beat Maryland to make it 13-1. While I was in school, they beat North Carolina, which, by the way, they tell me to laugh on that matter.

While I was there, we had Glenn Elmore, John Lucas. They had Tom McMillen and NC State had Dave Thompson. We didn't win anything in the postseason after that because they had such a great deal. It hurt my feelings.

Gene, I want to thank you for having me here. Ladies and gentlemen, I am truly delighted to be here tonight. I have seen the list of past emcees and past award winners. Obviously, I am aware of who is up here on the dais this evening. So I am thrilled to join the long list of outstanding people who have been part of this very, very special night.

I want to first congratulate those honorees. It was so much fun just talking to them and shaking their hand. I felt Wuerffel's right arm! I am a better man for that. You have shown through your hard work and discipline that it is possible to succeed as a student and as an athlete.

I know there are many more out there who aren't getting the recognition that you are receiving tonight, but you truly are the best. I congratulate you out there—coaches, administrators, presidents—for showing the example that all young people need to become the best they can be.

All right. We are ready. Let's get to it. Tonight's program permits the NCAA to honor eight outstanding student-athletes from 1996, and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates.

Now, I take great pleasure in introducing the current student-athletes to you. We will begin out West.

Adam Burgasser, *University of California, San Diego, diving.*

Much of Adam's work for the past four years has been from a platform about 10 feet above the water. If he has his way, much of his future work will be done from a station much, much higher than that.

Adam entered college as an unknown entity. After four years of hard work, he left as one of the most accomplished divers in NCAA Division III history.

In four years of NCAA championship competition on the three-meter and one-meter boards, Adam finished lower than fifth only twice. He never finished lower than ninth on either board. Last year, he was named the outstanding Division III diver after winning the three-meter competition and placing second on the one-meter board at the 1996 NCAA championships. A four-time all-American, Adam set a record as a junior by scoring over 477 points at the 1995 NCAA championships.

Adam's diving scores were surpassed only by his scores in the classroom. The three-time academic all-American graduated with a 3.976 grade-point average and a degree in physics. He has earned several scholarships and fellowships, including an achievement award from NASA. He currently attends graduate school at Cal Tech, and has his sights set on NASA's astronaut program. (Applause)

Adam already has a head start on his interest in NASA. He worked with former astronaut Sally Ride in NASA's Kid-Sat program. Adam also minored in theatre, served as president of a theatre group, and volunteered as a drama teacher at a local high school. Adam will receive his award from Judy Sweet, director of athletics at the University of California, San Diego.

Ladies and gentlemen, Adam Burgasser, University of California, San Diego. (Applause)

I think Tony Bennett's last album was called "Here's One for the Ladies." Now we begin with one of the ladies with a capital "L".

Jennifer Clarkson, *Abilene Christian University, basketball*. (Applause)
When Jennifer broke into the starting lineup in the 20th game of her freshman year, she responded with a triple-double: 23 points, 11 rebounds and 10 assists. I am no basketball genius, but I know this: If I were the coach, I wouldn't have waited 20 games to put her in the starting lineup!

Jennifer must like the number 2. The two-time Division II player of the year, she scored more than 2,400 points in her career, placing her fifth on the NCAA Division II all-time list. Jennifer scored in double figures in 105 straight games and registered six triple-doubles. She hit 63 percent of her shots, putting her third all-time in Division II.

When she wasn't scoring points on the court, Jennifer was scoring them in the classroom. She graduated with a 3.5 grade-point average, majoring in elementary education. A GTE academic all-American, she also found time to participate in a Big Sisters-type program in Abilene, and was a frequent visitor to a community retirement home there.

No wonder Abilene Christian retired her jersey after last season! Congratulations, Jennifer.

Jennifer is still helping her school as a graduate assistant coach while making plans for a career in teaching.

She will receive her award from David Merrell, faculty athletics representative at Abilene Christian. Ladies and gentlemen, Jennifer Clarkson, Abilene Christian University. (Applause)

Oh, yes, the ACC.

Mike Fisher, *University of Virginia, soccer*. (Applause)
Mike Fisher has spent the last four years slicing through Virginia's soccer opponents. In the very near future, he hopes to be performing operations of a very different kind.

Mike Fisher's net worth to the Virginia soccer program can be summed up in one word: Results. Two national championships, four NCAA tournament appearances, 81 victories in four years. Much of this success is due to the consistent, unselfish and versatile play of Fisher, who played three different positions during his outstanding career.

Last month, the three-time all-American became only the fourth player ever to win two Hermann Trophies, soccer's version of the Heisman. He led the nation in scoring his junior year. This season, he led the nation in assists. He finished his career as Virginia's all-time leader in points and assists. He is only the sixth player in ACC history to record 40 goals and 40 assists in a career. He scored one goal for every four shots he took.

An academic all-American, he earned a 3.3 grade-point average in biology and premed, gaining him a regular spot on the ACC academic honor roll.

And while he couldn't use his hands on the soccer field, he hopes to make up for that with a career in orthopedic surgery. (Applause)

All you need to know about Mike's priorities is this: He was selected as an

alternate on the Olympic soccer team, but returned to campus instead and took an organic chemistry lab that lightened his course load this fall.

Mike will receive his award from Craig Littlepage, senior associate director of athletics at Virginia. Ladies and gentlemen, Mike Fisher, University of Virginia. (Applause)

I don't mean to give short script to the other conferences when I say ACC. I just feel like as though they are cousins of mine. I just wanted to point that out.

Here we go "Down South" once again.

Berit Puggaard, *Southern Methodist University, swimming*. (Applause)

Berit wins this year's long-distance award. She made the short trip from her home in Denmark; yes, that Denmark, to be with us tonight. She didn't swim here, but she probably could have.

Berit is one of seven current SMU swimmers and divers who were Olympians in Atlanta. She also represented Denmark in the 1992 Olympic Games, and was for five years a member of the Danish national team. That team won the 800-meter freestyle relay at the European championships in 1991.

Berit was named an NCAA all-American 25 times. She wasted no time making a splash at SMU. As a freshman, she won two titles at the Southwestern Conference Championships, then scored two top-10 finishes at the NCAA championships. She won the 200-meter butterfly in two straight NCAA championships, and helped SMU's relay teams win several NCAA titles, including the 1996 400-meter and the 1995 800 freestyle. She dominated the Southwestern Conference in freestyle and butterfly competition, and recorded so many top-three finishes at the conference championships, they considered naming the meet after her.

Berit's grade-point average was of championship caliber as well. She earned a 3.94 majoring in radio and television, and still found time to tutor high-school students in Dallas. (Applause)

Congratulations, Berit.

Berit is currently working on her masters in media science at Copenhagen University. She also swims on a club team in Denmark.

Berit will receive her award from Gerald Turner, president of SMU. Ladies and gentlemen, Berit Puggaard, Southern Methodist University. (Applause)

Jennifer Renola, *University of Notre Dame, soccer*. (Applause)

Most football fans are familiar with "Touchdown Jesus," the mural that overlooks the Notre Dame football stadium. After the numbers Jennifer Renola has put up for the last four years, Notre Dame officials may be thinking about putting a similar mural behind the soccer field.

You can figure most net-minders' goals-against average by using a calculator. To spot Jen's, you need a very powerful microscope. Starting every game for four years, she gave up 0.67 goals per game, registered an astounding 32 solo shutouts and shared in 30 others in an illustrious career that saw the Irish win 86 games in four years.

She led Notre Dame to its first-ever berth in the NAAs as a freshman. The following year, she led the Irish to the Big East championship and all the way to the NCAA championship game. As a junior, she shut out all six postseason opponents, carrying the Irish all the way to the NCAA title and breaking North Carolina's nine-year monopoly on the championship.

Last month, the three-time all-American wound up her fabulous career by once again leading the Irish to the NCAA championship game.

You certainly don't need a microscope to find her grade-point average: a 3.6 with majors in English and computer applications. Jennifer also found time to serve as an academic peer advisor and took part in the campus life-skills pro-

gram.

Jennifer will receive her award from Father William Beauchamp, executive vice-president at Notre Dame. Ladies and gentlemen, Jennifer Renola, University of Notre Dame. (Applause)

Yes, another one of our outstanding female athletes.

Annette Salmeen, UCLA, swimming. (Applause)

If you stacked up all of Annette's athletics and academic honors, you could probably fill an Olympic-sized swimming pool.

Annette has achieved a level of national and international success enjoyed by only a very select group of student-athletes. She won a gold medal at the 1996 Olympic Games as a member of the United States 800-freestyle relay team. She was a bronze medalist in the 200 butterfly at the 1995 World University Games.

Her performances in NCAA competition were equally impressive, earning all-American honors all four years. Last year she scored the fifth-highest point total ever at an NCAA championship. She won the 200 butterfly by more than two seconds, the first NCAA individual title for a UCLA women's swimmer. She was runner-up by less than half of a second in the 500-yard freestyle and set a school record in the 200-freestyle.

She scored consistently in Pac-10 championships as well, placing in the top three 11 times in her career. She won both the 100 and 200 butterflys at last year's Pac-10 meet.

Annette was a champion in the classroom, too. She graduated with a lofty 3.93 with a degree in chemistry and met community needs by working on low-income housing renovation projects during her junior and senior years. (Applause)

Congratulations, Annette.

Annette was a finalist for the 1996 NCAA Woman of the Year Award and she recently was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship.

Annette will receive her award from Peter Dalis, athletics director at UCLA. Ladies and gentlemen, Annette Salmeen, UCLA. (Applause)

There is this guy who is 42. He anchors a national broadcast. I'll try to keep my "gollies" to an adult roar. Tonight, I said: "Golly, that is Danny Wuerffel!" That is what I said.

Danny Wuerffel, University of Florida, football.

Danny has received so many awards in the last month, he has probably spent more time in a jacket and tie than he has in shoulder pads.

Last month, he won the Heisman Trophy. Last week, he won the national title to cap one of the most impressive careers ever in college football. Danny's passing-efficiency rating is the best in NCAA history. He is one of only two college quarterbacks ever to throw for 100 touchdowns. He and Ty Detmer are also the only two-time winners of the O'Brien Award, awarded to the nation's top quarterback.

The owner of nearly three dozen passing records, Danny helped lead Florida to four SEC championships and a four-year record of 44-6-1. Throughout his career, the Gators were consistently ranked among the top-four teams in the nation. Danny completed nearly 62 percent of his passes over four years, and at one point threw 121 passes without an interception.

Danny was pretty efficient in the classroom as well. He earned a 3.7 grade-point average, majoring in public relations. He is the first player to win the Heisman Trophy and the National Football Foundation's Scholar-Athlete-of-the-Year award in the same year. (Applause)

Congratulations, Danny.

Danny is also the president of the local chapter of the Fellowship of Christian

Athletes. This will be a long night for Danny. Immediately, if not sooner, after this dinner ends, he is taking a red-eye flight to San Francisco. He and his teammates leave tomorrow morning for Hawaii to prepare for next week's Hula Bowl.

Danny will receive his award from John Lombardi, president of Florida. Ladies and gentlemen, Danny Wuerffel, University of Florida. (Applause)

Well, you have another ACC man. I don't mean to say that so often.

Tiki Barber, University of Virginia, football. (Applause)

Tiki's twin brother, a defensive standout for the Cavaliers, was born a few minutes before Tiki. That may have been the last time Tiki ever lost a race.

Tiki Barber broke into Virginia's starting lineup as a junior and started the year with an 81-yard touchdown run against Michigan. He hasn't slowed down since. A two-time all-ACC performer, Tiki made headlines last year by ripping Florida State for 193 yards, the most the Seminoles have yielded to any back this decade.

This year's Atlantic Coast Conference player of the year, Tiki led the conference in rushing, all-purpose yards and punt returns, the first player in 40 years to perform that feat. He rushed for more than 3,300 yards in his career, the most of any back in Virginia history. A third-team all-American, he rushed for over 100 yards in 19 games, a school record. Tiki has been a nominee the past two years for the Doak Walker Award, given to the nation's best running back.

Tiki is an African name that means "fiery-tempered king." He has proven to be a king in the classroom, too. He has earned a 3.3 grade-point average en route to a degree in commerce. He received a postgraduate scholarship from the National Football Foundation and is a two-time first-team academic all-American. He is also a fixture on the ACC honor roll. (Applause)

Mr. McEwen: Congratulations, Tiki.

If you are wondering where Tiki gets it from, listen to this. His mom, Geraldine, recently earned her master's degree in business administration with a 4.0 average. (Applause)

Tiki will receive his award from Terry Holland, director of athletics at Virginia. Ladies and gentlemen, Tiki Barber, University of Virginia. (Applause)

Tiki Barber will now respond on behalf of the current student-athletes. Tiki.

Tiki Barber: My mom never let me forget that she could outdo me in the classroom.

It is with great esteem that I stand here in acceptance of this award on behalf of my fellow student-athletes. It is a great honor and privilege to be in the presence of such influential and inspirational people as yourselves.

I first want to express our utmost thanks to the NCAA for this award and bringing us to the great city of Nashville. It has been an awesome experience here and something I have truly not experienced before. I also want to congratulate the Silver Anniversary award winners as well as Mr. Payne.

More importantly, I want to extend a hand to my fellow recipients. I am sure you all feel the same pride and accomplishments as I. Achievement not only athletically but scholastically is one of the truest awards you can receive for the endless hours put on the playing field and the classrooms.

When we first started this journey of becoming college student-athletes, I can only think of one word to describe our futures: uncertain. That is all that life had, the remnants of the easier days were left behind. In fact, I think it was a new challenge, a challenge that dragged us through the ups and downs and ins and outs of life.

We have been told that we should dream the impossible dream, to do what cannot be done, and if we always believe, we will always succeed. I think Ralph Waldo Emerson put it best when he said: "There is no life before, there is no life

behind us compared to what lies in us." I think that holds true for anything that we do, whether facing the national championship game with your toughest rival, or the final test in biochemistry. I think if your toughest and your truest allies are hard work, you will succeed.

Now, as we prepare to graduate, I think that we are going to begin to write new chapters in our lives, chapters filled with uncertainty but promises. I know the character, the integrity and the leadership ability that we have built as college student-athletes will continue as we strive for the future and know that the sky is the limit. Thank you. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF SILVER ANNIVERSARY HONOREES

Mr. McEwen: Nicely done. Thank you, Tiki. Let's have one more big round of applause for all our Top VIII Honorees. (Applause)

Tonight we get a chance to look in the future, and it looks like the future is going to be okay. It is a pleasure being up here tonight.

Now, let's meet this year's Silver Anniversary honorees.

Tommy Casanova, Louisiana State University, football. (Applause)

LSU beat up on a lot of opponents in the early '70s. When those opponents began looking for a reason for those losses, more often than not, they could "blame it on the Casanova."

Casanova did it all for LSU. He played offense; he played defense; he returned punts; and he returned kickoffs. He was all over the field, an outstanding leader wherever he lined up. During the two years he played offense, Tommy averaged over four yards per carry. On defense, he also intercepted six passes. His efforts those two years earned him consensus all-American honors. In his final season, he concentrated on defense, and was again named to several all-American teams. Tommy helped LSU garner an SEC championship and two bowl appearances. He was a three-time all-SEC performer, a feat accomplished by only one other Tiger player. His biggest plays were as a punt returner. In one game against Ole' Miss, Tommy ran back two punts for touchdowns, one for 61 yards, the other for 73.

Tommy played defensive back for the Cincinnati Bengals, and during that time eyed a career in medicine. He became Dr. Casanova, earning a degree in ophthalmology from the University of Cincinnati. Today, Tommy practices in his hometown of Crowley, Louisiana.

Despite a heavy surgical schedule, he is also an associate clinical professor at LSU. He is a member of the Louisiana State Senate, and last year was inducted into the College Football Hall of Fame.

Congratulations, Tommy. (Applause)

Tommy will receive his award from Joe Dean, athletics director at LSU. Ladies and gentlemen, Doctor, Senator Casanova, Louisiana State University. (Applause)

One of the fun things in talking to a lot of these people tonight was just going over the time that my school played their school. This next gentleman reminded me about the time that Penn State beat Maryland 77 to nothing. I thank him for that memory.

David Joyner, Pennsylvania State University, football and wrestling. (Applause)

Penn State recruiters didn't have to go far to find David Joyner. He was literally right under their nose at State College High School, about a mile from the Nittany Lions' campus.

Dave Joyner moved from State High to Penn State without missing a beat. An offensive lineman, Joyner was a member of the great undefeated 1969 Penn State

team that toppled Kansas in the Orange Bowl, finishing No. 2 in the national rankings. During his senior season, Joyner earned first-team all-American honors at tackle, and was the Lions' captain. He played on teams that went to three bowl games and won 29 of 33 games.

When football season ended each year, David joined the wrestling team. A formidable heavyweight, he was a three-time Eastern champion and was runner-up in the 1971 NCAA championships.

Joyner achieved all this while tackling a demanding premed curriculum in the classroom. A member of numerous undergraduate honor societies, Joyner earned his M.D. from Penn State's Medical Center in 1976. He now practices orthopedic surgery in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Throughout a distinguished medical career, Joyner hasn't strayed far from athletics, particularly through his extensive volunteer work with the U.S. Olympic Committee. He was the head physician for the USA at the 1992 Winter Olympics in Albertville, France.

A member of the GTE CoSIDA Academic all-America Hall of Fame, Dave continues to give back to college athletics through his medical group's sponsorship of the Butkus Award, presented annually to the nation's No. 1 linebacker.

Congratulations, David.

David will receive his award from Graham Spanier, president of Penn State. Ladies and gentlemen, David Joyner, Penn State University. (Applause)

Our next gentleman is close and dear to my heart because I wrestled in high school.

Ed Rust Jr., Illinois Wesleyan University, football and wrestling. (Applause)

Ed Rust contributed much to college athletics as a wrestler and football player at Illinois Wesleyan. Now, as a successful business executive, he is still "going to the mat" for college athletics.

Ed Rust was a star at Illinois Wesleyan, on and off the field. Wrestling in the 177-pound weight class as a junior, he won an NAIA district championship en route to a 10-3-1 record. He followed that up with 12 wins and another district championship in his senior year. He also started for two years as a guard on Illinois Wesleyan's football team. He was a dean's list student and served as president of a national business fraternity his senior year. He then went on to earn an MBA and a law degree.

Ed followed his collegiate successes with a meteoric rise to the top of the nation's largest homeowners' and auto insurance company. He joined State Farm's Dallas office in 1975, and within three years was named assistant vice-president. Ed was named CEO in 1985, and was elected to the additional post of chairman of the board in 1987.

Since then, he has overseen his company's strong and growing commitment to intercollegiate athletics. State Farm now sponsors some 70 collegiate athletics events, including women's volleyball and basketball tip-off classics that annually draw the nation's best teams.

Congratulations, Ed. (Applause)

In 1994, Ed's wrestling prowess earned him induction in the Hall of Outstanding Americans at the National Wrestling Hall of Fame.

Ed will receive his award from Dennie Bridges, athletics director at Illinois Wesleyan. Ladies and gentlemen, Ed Rust, Jr., Illinois Wesleyan University. (Applause)

James Tedisco, Union College (New York), basketball. (Applause)

Remember the old Excedrin commercials? You know, Excedrin Headache No. 1, Excedrin Headache No. 2. Rumor is that that ad campaign was dreamed up

by an ex-basketball player reminiscing about having to guard Jim Tedisco.

Though Jim had numerous opportunities to play major-college ball, he decided to stay home and play at Union College. He immediately established himself as the consummate point guard, setting the team's tempo offensively and defensively. In his sophomore year, Jim averaged 29 points a game. In the process, he helped turn a mediocre program into a winner. Union went 37-6 during his final two years.

He eased up a little during his junior and senior seasons, but still ended his career as Union's scoring leader, averaging 25 points a game. He led the Dutchmen to a 15-game winning streak in his senior year, eclipsing a 54-year-old school record. Just 5-10, he was a two-time little all-American. The first time he was named, he was the only small-college member on the first team.

Jim coached high-school basketball for several years and used the leadership skills learned as both player and coach to enter the political arena. At 27, he became the youngest person ever elected to the Schenectady, New York, City Council.

Since then, he has compiled an impressive record as a legislative leader in local and state government. Jim has spearheaded important legislation to enhance the care, health and safety of children.

Congratulations, Jim. (Applause)

Jim will receive his award from Ted Bick, faculty athletics representative at Union. Ladies and gentlemen, James Tedisco, Union College. (Applause)

This next honoree was an inspiration to me and my friends as I was growing up. We thought he was talented. We thought he was very bright. We thought he was cool all at the same time.

Herb Washington, Michigan State University, track and field. (Applause)
Herb Washington has made quite a name for himself, as an athlete and as a successful businessman. His greatest fame, though, may have come from an "art" he perfected – the "art" of stealing.

Herb Washington was recognized as one of the world's greatest sprinters while competing for Michigan State. He tied or broke the world record in the 50- and 60-yard dashes several times during his college career. A four-time all-American and an NCAA champion, he also won seven Big-10 titles.

Equally adept in the classroom, he was awarded the Big-10 Medal of Honor for his achievements in academics and athletics.

The NFL Baltimore Colts drafted him in 1972, but he answered a different call instead. Legendary baseball owner Charlie Finley signed him to steal the bases for the Oakland A's. Herb, thus, became Major League Baseball's first "designated pinch runner," stealing 29 bases and playing in the World Series in his very first season.

After baseball, Herb joined Michigan Bell, where he served in several executive positions. Currently, Herb owns six McDonald's restaurants in upstate New York, employing some 300 people. He serves on several boards of directors, including the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and the United Negro College Fund.

Herb is also one of the three boxing commissioners in New York State. (Applause)

Congratulations, Herb.

Herb will receive his award from Merritt Norvell, director of athletics at Michigan State. Ladies and gentlemen, Herb Washington, Michigan State University. (Applause)

This next gentleman is the only athlete here who I watch every Saturday and

Sunday. Don't tell Dan Rather, please. He is an excellent broadcaster and even more of an excellent human being.

Jack Ford, Yale University, football. (Applause)

Athletes plead their cases to referees all the time. When Jack Ford did it, he was actually preparing himself for his future career.

Jack was a three-year starter at defensive back for Yale. As a sophomore, he helped the Bulldogs win the Ivy League title with two interceptions, one of which he returned 77 yards for a touchdown, the fourth longest in school history. He added two more touchdowns his junior year, when the Bulldogs were ranked ninth in the nation in both rushing defense and scoring defense.

Ford studied law at Fordham University, helping finance his education with the winnings from three appearances on the television quiz show, "Jeopardy."

He served as assistant prosecutor for Monmouth County in New Jersey, and then embarked on a successful career as a trial attorney, which included a successful defense of New Jersey's first death-penalty case.

He began his television career as a legal commentator at WCBS in New York, then joined cable's "Court TV" as an anchor. Since 1984, he has served as chief legal correspondent for the NBC television network, and is coanchor of the Today Show Weekend Edition.

He captured an Emmy Award for his work in 1989, and was nominated for another in 1991.

Congratulations, Jack. (Applause)

Jack serves as an adjunct professor of law at Fordham, and is a member of Monmouth University's Board of Trustees. He also serves on the board of directors of the Women's Resource Center of New Jersey, which provides assistance for victims of violent crimes.

Jack will receive his award from Barbara Chesler, associate director of athletics at Yale. Ladies and gentlemen, Jack Ford, Yale University. (Applause)

Now, Jack Ford will respond on behalf of the Silver Anniversary honorees.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY HONOREE RESPONSE

Jack Ford: I thank you. Not only is it an honor to be a recipient of this award this evening, but it has been a genuine thrill for me to meet the other recipients and also to be asked to represent them this evening. As with many celebrations, I think that receiving this Silver Anniversary Award is not without some degree of melancholy.

I will tell you a quick story as to why I say that. When I got the phone call from my friend, Barbara Chesler, at Yale saying I had been declared as one of the recipients of this award, I went home and sat with my wife, Dorothy, and children, Ashley and Collin. I explained to them the Silver Anniversary Award and what it means and its significance. They were elated, as I was. However, with the clarity and perspective that comes only through the eyes of a child, my 10-year-old Collin looks at me and he says: "Hey, dad, that is really great. How are you dealing with the bad news?" I said: "What bad news?" He said: "Well, the fact that you guys played your collegiate games a quarter of a century ago." Not surprisingly, none of the six of us are terribly comfortable with that characterization.

When we met earlier today, Tommy Casanova expressed a concern that we all shared. "Are our tapes in black and white that they are going to show tonight?" Of course, I know the NCAA got involved in some colorization for us to just make us not feel as old as we otherwise would feel. We decided we were much more comfortable with the characterization that we ended our collegiate careers a mere 25 years ago. That sounds a lot better.

We are here tonight to celebrate the ideal of college athletics, to celebrate the ideal of student-athletes. What we see tonight in the Silver Anniversary Award winners, and Billy Payne as the Theodore Award Winner, are representatives of the past and the present of that ideal. What we see in our Top VIII award winners are representative of the present and the future.

As we celebrate that ideal this evening, especially in light of you folks out there and what you all do with intercollegiate athletics, we can't ignore the challenges that face college athletics. Sadly, there is a perception among many out there that college athletics are populated by brainless, lawless mercenaries who serve a corrupt system.

I think the challenge for all of us is twofold. First, is to recognize there are some problems. They are not quite as pervasive, they are not quite as profound as perhaps some people think, but they are there and they need to be dealt with. They are not insurmountable. Secondly, we need to do a much better job—by “we” I mean also those of us in the media—of heralding the accomplishments of current student-athletes, of looking at these eight young people who we honor tonight and saying to the rest of the world they are emblematic of the very best of college athletics and there are many more of them out there.

I think that the rest of the world needs to know that. We are all here tonight, those of us at these two head tables, beneficiaries of a wonderful gift. It was a gift of a college education. It was a gift that was augmented wonderfully by our participation in intercollegiate athletics. But as with many gifts, you don't often recognize immediately the value of that gift. It is a challenge for the young people who are student-athletes.

I can recall when I was a 17-year-old senior in high school. I came home to a telegram and told my mother, who was struggling to raise four children by herself, that not only had I been accepted at Yale, but I had received a scholarship that would allow me to go there. I think she knew at the time what a gift that was. But with the absence of wisdom that a 17-year-old enjoys, I don't think I did. But as I look back on it now, once again, we have all agreed to refer as the passage of a mere 25 years, I recognize what an invaluable gift that was.

As we celebrate tonight, we recognize that you folks out there are entrusted with the health and well being of college athletics. It is a difficult mission. I am going to be presumptuous enough on behalf of my fellow honorees here to offer a suggestion to you, to help you accomplish that mission. It is a concept that I naturally borrowed from parenthood, something I had seen one time that I thought best described the nature and the obligations of parenthood. I think it is especially applicable to the nature and the obligations that all of you feel as those who are the ones in charge of the guidance of college athletics.

It was said that the true obligation of parents, and by extension, the obligation of you folks, is to provide both roots and wings for the children, for student-athletes, to provide the roots that will allow them to withstand the buffeting of life's winds and the wings to allow them, when it is time, to have the confidence and the independence and the ability to fly away on their own.

It is a challenge for college athletics, but it is a challenge we need to meet. So tonight as you honor us, I am indeed thrilled on behalf of my fellow honorees to thank our parents, to thank our families and also to thank our colleges for having given all of us our roots and our wings. Thank you all. (Applause)

PRESENTATION OF THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Mr. McEwen: Thank you, Jack, and congratulations to you and your colleagues. Let's have one more big round of applause for all our Silver Anniversary

honorees. (Applause)

Now, it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors program—the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

Your program includes pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a varsity athletics award in college, has exemplified the ideals and purposes to which college athletics is dedicated. It is a distinguished group, including, as you will note, former presidents, military leaders and pioneers in space and medicine. All truly have been worthy of this recognition.

Our honoree has always dreamed big dreams. He dreamed of playing football at the University of Georgia. He did. At Georgia, he dreamed of winning conference championships. It happened twice. He dreamed of becoming a successful lawyer and community leader. He did that as well. Then he dreamed the impossible dream, something bigger, something better. Combining a love for sports and a love for community, he decided to bring the Olympics to Atlanta. Most people figured it couldn't happen. Well, it was possible, especially for someone who each day asks himself one simple question: “Did you do your best today?”

When Billy Payne began his crusade to bring the Olympics to Atlanta, most observers didn't give him a chance. But those who really knew him were not at all surprised when they heard about his dream. Billy had been achieving all his life. He is the son of the late Porter Payne, an all-SEC lineman and captain of the 1949 Georgia football team. The son became quite the football player himself. He was all-state quarterback in high school, and Vince Dooley recruited him to Georgia to play offensive end. But by his senior year, he had developed into an all-American defensive end. Those teams lost just four games in three years, played in three major bowls and won the 1968 SEC title.

But football was never the focal point of Billy's life. He graduated from Georgia's law school, aided by postgraduate scholarships from the NCAA and the National Football Foundation. During the next 15 years, he built a successful law practice, specializing in real estate.

But Billy Payne was looking for something bigger. That “something bigger” became the pursuit of the Olympics. In 1987, he left his law partnership, borrowed \$1.5 million, and for three years drew no salary as he doggedly pursued the Olympics for Atlanta. Steadily, he persuaded others to join the cause—friends, business and political leaders, the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Against great odds, Atlanta was awarded the Centennial Games. Payne then mobilized a force that grew to 70,000 employees and volunteers who planned and organized those Games. With no financial underwriting from any level of government, Payne raised some \$1.5 billion and staged the biggest and, yes, the best Olympics in history.

Record attendance, unprecedented TV viewership around the world, billions of dollars in economic impact, and a legacy of new stadiums, dormitories and other structures presented to the host city. All because one person dreamed. (Applause)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to present to you the 1997 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner, the dreamer, William Porter “Billy” Payne. (Applause)

President Corrigan: In recognition of your superb undergraduate career as a student and an athlete, and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, this award is presented to you for your rare combination of vision, passion and leadership, which you have exhibited through your support of civic and charitable causes, and by your tireless and selfless efforts to bring

to Atlanta, Georgia, and stage the Centennial Olympic Games in 1996.

Ladies and gentlemen, William Porter "Billy" Payne. (Applause)

Mr. Payne: Thank you very much, Gene. Hello, ladies and gentlemen. I am here tonight to first and importantly express my gratitude. Secondly, to express my admiration and indeed the inspiration that I received from these young eight current athletes as they themselves had been my personal heroes now for so many years, and the joy that I see in all the silver foxes who themselves have returned tonight, establishing surely and proving even as we sit here tonight, that you, assembled in this audience, athletic and academic administrators, built these ladies and gentlemen into the fine people they are.

I look at these super eight, these eight undergraduates who have so distinguished themselves. As we honor you tonight, as we rejoice in your own accomplishments, I feel then I should advise you also of the great burden that you take forward from tonight. That is that we have such high and incredible expectations of you and for you in the future. So as you take on additional challenges, as your life becomes complex, as you seek to demonstrate and to fulfill your own dreams, please note that all of us assembled here tonight, and others who have celebrated your success as well, expect so much more from you over the next 50 years.

I received notification some weeks ago that I had been chosen to receive the Theodore Roosevelt Award from the NCAA. To say I was shocked is a significant understatement. As I read the previous list of award winners, I was literally, literally shocked and humbled and must confess to smiling a bit as I felt the pride, as I wondered how my name would look recorded for all history beside the names of four former presidents and some of the truly great athletes of our time.

Yet, I knew something was wrong, because as I reviewed that list and as it became obvious to me that all of the previous honorees had achieved their success as a consequence of their own individual skills, I knew something was wrong. In my case, the successes that I had been privileged to enjoy are not a consequence of my own skills, but are, in fact, attributable to the people who have allowed me to stand on their shoulders for these so many years. So I think tonight in a very real sense that I stand before you representing the tens of thousands of scholar-athletes who have preceded me and who have themselves achieved success because people like you in this audience and others who loved them, supported them so significantly, so unselfishly...supported by friends and family who simply refused to allow them to fail.

In my case, I have had so many such supporters. My parents, especially my dad, who taught me one lesson in life, and that is: "Success is always, Billy, a consequence of your effort." To my college coach and wonderful friend, Vince Dooley, who taught me as I have observed him now for these many years, that class and dignity can and do indeed last an entire career without compromise. To my college president at my beloved University of Georgia, Dr. Chuck Demming, who made me, and I thought it was impossible, but made me prouder of my university every single year of his administration. To those 70,000 wonderful staff and volunteers of the Olympic Committee for the Olympic Games, who made my passion in life the organization of these games, the sharing with the world of the great spirit of the American South and the friendliness of the American people who made my passion their life's work. Obviously, to my family, to my son, Porter, and daughter, Elizabeth, and to my wonderful wife, Martha, whose goodness and graciousness would make anybody succeed.

So I stand here before you tonight proud, yes, to have my name included on

this list, but also assured that I represent those thousands of us, who as inter-collegiate athletes, have benefitted so significantly because others supported us along the way.

So as I accept this award humbly, as I accept this award proudly, and, yes, gratefully, I do so also on behalf of all the other student-athletes whose success has been attributable to your assistance over the years. Thank you and God bless you. (Applause)

Mr. McEwen: As the saying goes, what a night! It has been an honor and privilege for me to stand up here and be surrounded by excellence and bring them to you. I think it is terrific that you take time from your busy schedules to recognize these individuals, all of whom truly epitomize the values of intercollegiate athletics.

I appreciate your inviting me to share this evening with you. Thanks once again. Good luck with your discussions this week. It has been an honor. Thank you. (Applause)

President Corrigan: Thank you, Mark. You were terrific. Without a question, you put everybody at ease and you helped everybody enjoy themselves. Because you have done this, the NCAA will be sending a check to the University of Maryland in your name.

Having watched you shoot those three pointers, maybe they will give you a scholarship. I don't know. You looked awfully good. (Laughter) Thank you.

We do have one other item of business that we passed over. Vince, if you will come up here, we will give you a plaque to take back to the university so you can honor your distinguished alumnus. (Applause)

I, like Billy, Jack and everybody, am just always overwhelmed by these young people, what they have accomplished. As Billy said, they have got so much in front of them. They have just so much. You are just terrific. You inspire us.

One of the great things about being a coach is that I always felt that I learned as much from them as they ever learned from me. You represent the best, and there is nothing better than intercollegiate athletics in my mind. It provides great opportunity to a diverse group of people who ultimately end up really caring about each other.

Now, we will be dismissed after Reverend Mona Boggasow presents the benediction.

BENEDICTION

Reverend Boggasow: Please stand. With your eyes wide open, we repeat the benediction. We are invited to go from this place grateful for and certainly inspired by what we have seen and heard, anticipating in our own lives the opportunities for excellence that present themselves to us each day.

Be delighted by surprise, be filled with hope. After all, we can now say Super Bowl and Patriot in the same sentence. Go in peace. Amen.

■ General Business Session

Monday Morning, January 13, 1997

The general business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with President Corrigan presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Corrigan: Let me welcome you to the general business session of the 1997 Convention. As you know, we normally do not open the morning with the general business session, but this session was scheduled so that we can consider and vote on the nonfederated amendments to the membership's structure legislation before moving to our division business sessions.

Before we begin voting on the membership-structure proposals, I have a few announcements. All of the voting actions during this Convention will appear in the January 27 issue of *The NCAA News*. That will include all the voting actions and any related interpretations. Because all legislation specifically identified for consideration on Presidential Agenda Day requires a roll-call vote, you will need your voting units.

[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained.]

We are now ready to take action on Proposal No. 7, which is on Page 7 of your Official Notice.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Delay of Effective Date

John Parry (Butler University): In the spirit of collegiality and in the belief that we can work together and that there is trust, on behalf of all members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference, we withdraw Proposal No. 7.

Unidentified Delegate: Does that mean a "no" on this proposal?

President Corrigan: Any delegate can move the proposal.

Unidentified Delegate: Does it make sense that I speak against it?

President Corrigan: I don't think you need to at this point. Thank you.

David Baker (University of Wyoming): I'm representing the University of Wyoming. I would like to move Proposal No. 7.

[The motion was seconded.]

I want to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7. The University of Wyoming is a member of the Western Athletic Conference. I want to make it clear that I am not speaking for the WAC. I am stating the University of Wyoming's institutional position.

Since this is the last time that institutional members will be given the privilege of this floor, it seems appropriate that we express our position now. The University of Wyoming's football team completed its season 10-2 and ranked in the top 25 in the nation. We were passed over for postseason play by all the bowls.

Our president made an appeal to the Presidents Commission that fell on deaf ears. Our conference made a proposal to the Presidents Commission, which was duly gutted yesterday. The present NCAA structure has been totally unresponsive to the abuses that have occurred in Division I-A post-

season football. The restructuring proposals appear to leave Division I-A squarely to the tender mercies of the abusers. We are talking here about a strategy to keep more than \$100 million in bowl revenues outside the purview of the NCAA membership. We are talking here about a bowl alliance scheme that probably violates the Sherman Antitrust Act. We are talking here about building a house in Division I that will shelter six conferences that distributed among themselves about \$95 million of those postseason revenues.

Proposal 7 would postpone NCAA restructuring for one year. The University of Wyoming believes that voting for restructuring of Division I now would be an exercise in self-denial that ill serves our student-athletes and could well further marginalize our program in the future. Therefore, we will vote "yes" for Proposal No. 7.

R. Gerald Turner (Southern Methodist University): I speak on behalf of Merrill Bateman, president of the Western Athletic Conference. Although we respect the right of our sister institution to speak, and did speak on behalf of that institution, we would want the Convention to know that the Western Athletic Conference supports enthusiastically restructuring and we are pleased to do so because of the work that has been done over all the years.

We are also pleased that the Presidents Commission has asked the Board of Directors to study postseason football, because of our hope that it will be run consistent with the principle that participation in championships is based upon the performance of teams. We urge the Convention to support restructuring. Thank you.

Kenneth A. Shaw (Syracuse University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal.

For more than two years, the membership has worked to reorganize the NCAA into a new structure that more effectively meets the needs of the members of each division. An oversight committee, chaired by former NCAA President Joe Crowley, has monitored the development of the overall structure and the core principles that preserve the Association while permitting each division the freedom to govern itself. The Presidents Commission and Council have monitored the developments in each division to ensure they are consistent with the core principles and meet the needs of the membership.

The basic new structure was created by legislation overwhelmingly adopted by the members of all divisions in January 1996. Each division is now considering the legislation needed to create the substructure and to handle many details. Each division is working very hard in implementing what we think will be a grand design. Many of you and your colleagues have devoted considerable energy to bringing the NCAA to the threshold of a new, more responsive structure—one that allows each member to work with its peers in its division of choice, to operate with considerable autonomy through greater and better federation. We urge you to join with the Presidents Commission and the Council to defeat this attempt at delaying and allow the future of the NCAA to begin.

Rev. James N. Loughran (St. Peter's College): This is my annual plea for honesty and sanity. Consider it also opposition to No. 7. For the past dozen years or so, college presidents have been exhorting us to attend the NCAA Convention. The motivating premise is that something is seriously wrong with big-time college sports—cheating, greed, financial extravagance, antiacademic courses, hypocrisy. Only the presidents can correct things.

So far, obviously, we have failed. I say what Cedric Dempsey said: that

things have gotten worse. In Dallas last year, we were urged to vote for Proposal 7 and restructuring. Finally, the presidents would really be in charge. What has happened since then? Nothing as far as I can see, except debates about revenue-sharing guarantees and the involvement of individuals other than white males in the wielding of power. In the meanwhile, there is the standard truckload of other legislation to quarrel with. Nothing has improved or will improve until we face up to it. Big-time college sports are caught between irreconcilable objectives. Amateurism and academic integrity, on the one hand, prominence and profit on the other. But in this tug of war, it seems amateurism and academic integrity don't have a chance.

Certainly by now, history has proven that reform, more rules and greater enforcement is not the solution. If it "ain't broke, don't fix it," they say. But what if it is broke and, moreover, it can't be fixed? Does American higher education have the courage and integrity to face up to that possibility?

Let's vote against No. 7 and see what happens with college presidents fully in charge. Let's see if we really are on the edge of profound change as Cedric Dempsey promises.

President Corrigan: Let me explain where we are on this proposal. The first vote, which will require a two-thirds majority of all divisions voting together, will handle 7-A, 7-B, 7-D, 7-F, 7-G and 7-H.

[Parts A, B, D, F, G and H of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) were defeated, 105-667-13.]

President Corrigan: The next items that we will vote on will be 7-C, 7-E and 7-I. We only need one vote. We don't need to go through each division. That will be taken care of by the computer.

[Parts C, E and I of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) were defeated (Division I: 33-268-5; Division II: 23-171-4; Division III: 64-176-7).]

President Corrigan: We have one more item on 7, but we will have to wait because we will need those voting pads again. Just a comment on what occurred in this room last night. I think we were all, as always, stunned by the accomplishments of the student-athletes who were honored here. We forget sometimes to thank the people who put that together. Jim Marchiony and his staff at the NCAA, I think, do a fabulous job of presenting the accomplishments of these students. (Applause) It is a very nice evening when it moves as quickly as that does and as well. Jim, we congratulate you and your staff on a terrific job. (Applause)

[Part J of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was defeated, 55-652-15.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—Division I Cabinets

Brother Thomas J. Scanlan (Manhattan College): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 34 does two things. First, it extends the conference representative system upon which the restructuring of Division I is based to the cabinets. In addition, as I-AA and I-AAA have already demonstrated, when we work in concert through our commissioners, we are able to efficiently achieve the gender-minority role. For example, the faculty athletics reps' goals for membership on the Board of Directors, the Management Council, and now with Proposal No. 34, with the Cabinet membership.

I note in closing that Proposal No. 34 is supported by the Presidents Commission.

Larry L. Travis (Western Carolina University): I rise in favor of Proposal

No. 34. During the just completed Southern Conference meeting in November, we asked for our commissioners to secure names of individuals who are both qualified and willing to serve on the new Cabinet.

It was an amazing process; the conference took this very seriously. We were able not only to determine who was the best qualified, but in each case, who had the time to commit to this process. I would suggest to each delegate this is how the process should work—select the best qualified person who has the time and the commitment needed to serve. I urge the Convention to approve Proposal No. 34.

I rise in favor of the proposal. If adopted, it replaces certain parts of Proposal No. 28-N, relating to the appointment and removal of cabinet members.

As has been pointed out, it allows the conferences to establish a rotation that will allow us to achieve the diversity that we seek in the governance structure. If adopted, it simply will replace certain portions of 28-N and make those moot, but not affect the remainder.

I urge, on behalf of the Big Sky Conference and my colleagues in Division I-A and I-AAA, approval of this motion.

[Proposal No. 34 (Page A-92) was adopted in Division I, 296-14-3.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—NCAA Committee Structure

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada, Reno): I would like to move Proposal No. 28, Parts A through M.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 28-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 28-2 will amend the relevant provisions of 28 to provide that in Association-wide committees with divisional representation, the representation from Division I will include appropriate representation from all three subdivisions.

It is my understanding and certainly my hope that this legislation is not controversial within our division. I hope the body will approve it.

[Proposal No. 28-2 (Page A-86) was adopted (Division I: 259-61-0; Division II: 138-8-5; Division III: 182-12-17).]

Mr. Crowley: I make this motion on behalf of the Transition Oversight Committee, which I have had the honor to chair this past year, as well as on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council.

The delegates will recall that last year we passed the framework legislation for restructuring embodying the three core principles of this effort, including the establishment of presidential authority over the Association's affairs as well as moving us toward a more federated and simplified organization in what had become an inordinately complex administrative structure.

We understood when we did this a year ago that there was much detail that awaited our attention. In the Transition Oversight Committee this past year, we have given attention in particular to the question of where committees fit within this new framework.

We focused on developing a new committee structure for the Association. We wanted to assure that where it made sense for functions that are common to the divisions, that we would provide a new structure so that those committees would be there in common form or as Association-wide com-

mittees.

We determined that there were 11 general committee functions that could fit this description. So we recommended—and this legislation embodies this recommendation—that those functions be retained in the new structure as an Association-wide set of committees. These include the committees like Honors and the Committee on Women's Athletics, Minority Opportunities and Interests, and Postgraduate Scholarship, and so on. It is intended that each division will select its own representatives to these committees and that these Association-wide committees will report to the new Executive Committee, which is itself Association-wide in nature.

All of the sports committees that are currently working in an Association-wide or at least multidivision capacity are also retained in this legislation. All of the other committee functions have been assigned to the divisional governance structure, with the understanding being that it is in that structure of federated governance that the legislation of the future will be enacted.

Each of the transitional teams dealt with how to put the framework of these committees together. That is accomplished later in this legislation and will be acted on in the division sessions later this morning. I do want to emphasize that by federating much of the committee structure within the Association, that it was the intention of the oversight committee, and I am sure as well of the Council and the Commission, that we would encourage continuing communication in this new structure where there are matters or issues of common interests. We would want to ensure as best we can that the federated committees are in communication with one another. We trust that that effort will be successful.

So, Mr. Chairman, Proposal No. 28 is really the capstone of the restructuring efforts. It has been a long road we have traveled. I would like to urge again on behalf of the Transition Oversight Committee, the Presidents Commission and the Council, support for Proposal No. 28 in its entirety, but at this general business session, particularly Parts A through M. Thank you.

James R. Appleton (University of Redlands): I am cochair of the Division III Restructuring Task Force. I have had the privilege of serving under Joe Crowley's leadership as a member of the oversight committee. I speak in support of the restructuring.

While Division III did not initiate the dialogue that began this process, we have willingly participated in it. We have been heard in the deliberations. While every detail may not be exactly to our individual preferences, compromises have been made that, in my opinion, will enable us to conduct our business in the future consistent with our philosophy in Division III. I recommend that Division III institutions support restructuring.

James E. Delany (Big Ten Conference): Just a point of information. What is the procedure to handle 28-1?

President Corrigan: That will be handled in the Division I session.

Mr. Delany: So if this would pass, we would subsequently, if we desire, have an opportunity to amend it for Division I?

President Corrigan: Yes. We are not going to adopt 28-N this morning. You will have an opportunity at your Division I meetings to have that discussed. When we come back this afternoon, it will be before you.

Mr. Delany: No. 34 did not make 28-N moot?

President Corrigan: Only as to the selection process for the cabinets, Jim.

Mr. Delany: Thank you.

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I have a point of order. Will Proposal No. 139, which is sponsored by the NCAA Council, be moot by 28-E at this session? Or do we have an opportunity in the Division I business session to address that issue?

President Corrigan: The advice of the parliamentarian is that it will be moot upon adoption of 28-E.

Mr. Ensor: Is it in order at this point to move No. 139?

President Corrigan: We already have a motion on the floor, Rich. I am sorry. Is there anyone else approaching the microphones? We are ready to vote on No. 28.

[Parts A and C of Proposal No. 28 (Page A-36) were adopted, 766-8-7. Parts B, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L and M were adopted as amended by No. 28-2 (Division I: 290-5-2; Division II: 196-2-1; Division III: 261-1-0.)]

President Corrigan: I think we owe a great deal of thanks and credit to President Joe Crowley, the chair of the Transition Oversight Committee, for the work that he did with his kindly manner and his abiding patience. Joe, on behalf of everybody, thank you very much. (Applause)

By No. 28-E being adopted, No. 28-1 has been mooted. That brings us to No. 30, which we understand has been withdrawn. That finishes the business for this session this morning. You should head for your various divisional meetings. You have got about 35 minutes before 9:45. We will be in recess at this time.

[The general business session was recessed at 9:15 a.m.]

Monday Afternoon, January 13, 1997

The general business session was called to order at 4 p.m., by President Corrigan.

OPENING REMARKS

President Corrigan: We need to begin right now. When Division I took a break, we were in the midst of a tragedy. We need to come back to where we were. So we are going to ask Divisions II and III to allow Division I to finish up a piece of work that we were in the midst of when the break was taken.

I think the best way to do this is to try to answer the questions and concerns that were voiced from the delegates from the floor regarding Proposal 62 and its effect on Bylaw 20. The best man we know to do that is Steve Morgan, who spends his time interpreting the bylaws and constitution of this organization, to fill us in on what impact this would have so that we can get to a vote on 62.

Steve, if you would, please.

Steve Morgan (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Mr. President. I think the question that was on the floor and was unsatisfactorily answered in Division I, is whether there is impact, as Gene just said, of Proposal No. 62 on Bylaw 20. That would solve Division I institutions' head count for meeting the institutional amendment.

The most important thing, as several Council members and others have discussed up here during the break, to note is that it is not the intent of Proposal 62 to alter the current application of Bylaw 20 and those institu-

tional aid amendments. The important thing among those was the fact that at the 1994 Convention it adopted a specific provision that says that a Division I member can count on-campus employment for its athletics interests toward reaching the minimum for institutional aid to stay in Division I.

So I think the impact of this principal bylaw is that it doesn't alter the current circumstance. Those Council members and others involved in that discussion hope they have been responsive to the concerns of the delegates who had that question.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Financial Aid—Division I Employment Earnings

President Corrigan: Thank you. We were on Proposal 62 and considering Part B—employment outside the declared playing season. That is before us. A “yes” vote leaves that in the proposal, a “no” vote takes it out. Is there any more discussion?

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University at Carbondale): I would urge the assembly to vote “no” on Part B and allow the student-athletes to work in a time that they think is best for them at their discretion. When they are burdened with their academic endeavors or their athletics, they will want to work when work is available that suits their professional goals. Athletes who are long-distance runners can't work during their season; they probably couldn't work all year long.

A lot of people have an opportunity on campus to do an internship. It may be in their season, it may just be one or two hours a week. For instance, a communications major in radio and television could spend an hour or two a week in their in-season. So I would hope that we would defeat Part B.

Barbara Church (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): One more clarification, please. If Proposal No. 62 is passed, does it apply to the partial scholarship athletes? If so, if somebody is receiving \$1,000 in financial aid, would they have to be in residence one year and eligible academically in order to work?

President Corrigan: The answer is “yes” to the first one. As for the second question, only if they want the aid to be exempt.

Bridget Niland (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/State University of New York at Buffalo): We just want to clarify our position on the work issue. Once again, we are in support of voting “no” on Part B. Originally in our discussions on this issue, our committee voted in favor of Proposal 63.

However, we have also discussed both 62 and 63. It was our decision to go after 62 for fear of not getting either. Thank you.

[Part B of Proposal No. 62-1 (Page A-129) was defeated, 78-237-5.]

Robert J. Frank (Oregon State University): I understand the interpretation that was given with regards to this proposal does not affect the minimum financial aid requirements. The thing that scares me is the interpretation that was given to us earlier today.

Will the Council put forth another interpretation that states that Bylaw 20 will not be effective with the adoption of this proposal?

Mr. Morgan: We said that Proposal 62, if adopted, does not alter the application of Bylaw 20 as currently written. Whether there will be future changes in that, of course, will be the subject for the governance structure—the current one or the future one in Division I.

I think the important thing to note here is that the adoption of this proposal does not alter the application of Bylaw 20.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): Proposal 62 is the third visit to the same student legislation that was defeated in the past two Conventions. It has become obvious that despite efforts to eliminate the issues of concern, they still remain. If we look at the facts and not the emotions, I believe this legislation must be opposed again. The defeat of Part B unfortunately does not solve the primary problem with this legislation.

Removal of the concern about when the money is earned, unfortunately, does not eliminate the problem of monitoring and policing the amounts earned. The proposal provides earnings only up to the cost of attendance. Compliance officers will have to collect and analyze student-earnings records, assist them in the monitoring of total earnings both from on-campus and off-campus employers, to determine which earnings are countable and/or exempt will still be necessary.

I ask again if you are prepared to have students submitting time for this. While I have read what the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has said about the importance of the legislation and improving student welfare, the benefit of this does not justify the difficulties or costs.

According to present rules, students can already work on or off campus during the summer and all school vacations, including up to one week before Christmas vacation. As a practical matter, it is said that many students do not work during the playing season. So under current legislation, students are effectively only prohibited from working for just part of the academic year. The fact is that students who want to work or feel the need to work have an opportunity to do so. Beyond this work option, to respond to the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's argument about bias and the need for more money, we should look at our needy students who can already meet college expenses not covered by scholarships.

In addition to borrowing as a last resort, Pell Grants are entirely exempt and the NCAA has boosted the dollars to the student's special assistance fund for students with special needs. Even without this legislation, our student-athletes are far better off than the majority of our student population.

As a result of the official interpretation, this legislation will also result in increased direct costs. In addition to the cost of policing, institutions that were including work in the award limitations may be forced to match the exempted earnings with other aid in order to remain competitive in recruiting or perhaps even meet conference minimum requirements for sports equivalencies.

Finally, there are other, more technical issues regarding the treatment of federal work-study earnings or the wide institution disparity between number of grants-in-aid and institutional cost of attendance, which will surely need to be addressed. Proposal 62 is well intentioned financial legislation, but despite the best efforts, it will be costly to implement. Despite my appearance to the contrary, I do recognize the issue of the student-athlete's welfare. I understand the student needs. I was director of financial aid for 10 years, but it is the athletics administration issues of this legislation that require our attention. Within the financial aid definition, rules and principles under which we operate, students are well served.

Despite our best efforts, this legislation, like those of prior years, does not revise student-employment legislation in a fair or cost-effective manner. I

urge you to please defeat Proposal No. 62.

Unidentified Delegate: In light of the representative from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee making the committee's opinion known on its preference for Proposal No. 63, I would like a point of clarification. What happens to Proposal No. 63 if we vote in favor of Proposal No. 62?

President Corrigan: No. 63 would be moot.

Unidentified Delegate: Then I am confused. Why wasn't 63 voted on before 62.

President Corrigan: The motion to do that was defeated.

Mr. Frank: I am again concerned this Convention will do what it has done in some previous years, which is talk this into the ground. I think there is an easy way to address all of the objections. That is to defeat No. 62 and to pass 63, as amended by 63-1.

Ms. Niland: I am talking about the issue to date. If we are talking about "again" in terms of a compliance tracking nightmare that the speaker from Central Connecticut addressed, again let me point out that in our discussions and in our consultation with our Council reps, and as my experience as a graduate assistant in compliance now, we are talking about this as it pertains to Division I full-scholarship athletes who choose to work. There will be some students who do not choose to work. The tracking issue, if you still feel that is a problem after this, after explaining that it will be a limited number of student-athletes, then you have the option to not vote for 62 and to adopt 63.

Whatever you choose to do, please, it may be an issue of emotion, but that is because it is important to student-athletes. The student-athletes, as we were reminded yesterday and we are reminded each and every year, are the core and the focus of the NCAA. Please, let's not put this off another year, because as a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we are not going to let this one go.

Joseph Lang (Georgetown University): I have a question. Is it appropriate to ask for this discussion on 62 to be tabled so we can consider 63?

President Corrigan: No, that would be out of order, Joe. I am sorry.

Are we ready to vote on No. 62? Push your desired button and lock it in. The polls are now closed.

[Proposal No. 62 (Page A-128) was adopted as amended by No. 62-1 in Division I, 169-150-6.]

We are going to go ahead with the business of the afternoon, which is to vote on any remaining nonfederated legislation. Those proposals are listed on Page 239 of the Official Notice. Once we have concluded the voting on all Presidential Agenda Day legislation, if time permits, we will continue with those nonfederated proposals that are not specifically designated for Presidential Agenda Day.

I might note that the consent package will be considered at tomorrow's general business session. I would also like to point out that Proposal No. 135 will be considered only in the general session either today or tomorrow, and not in the separate division business sessions as is noted in Appendix A of the Official Notice. You will see a listing of all the voting actions of the divisions' and subdivisions' business sessions held earlier today. Those actions stand unless they are reconsidered or rescinded during this session, which is what we term the window of reconsideration, which is now open.

Please remember that if you wish to move for reconsideration of an action, you must have voted on the prevailing side. A motion to reconsider is debat-

able. If the proposal to reconsider was voted on by roll call, the motion to reconsider will have to be a roll-call vote as well. A simple majority can prevail for a motion to reconsider. Are there any motions to reconsider?

Reconsideration of Vehicle Registration— Division I Football and Basketball

Robert A. Bowlsby (University of Iowa): Having voted on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 60, I move for reconsideration in Division I-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the risk of initiating an extended grouping process, this is one of those pieces of legislation that once amended kind of gets away from us. We are now in a situation where I-AA football will not be complying with a similar piece of legislation.

None of our basketball players or people in other sports will be complying with the registration. I think that many of us do it on our own campus on our own volition. At the present time, we are going back to campus with a regulation for I-A football only, which I don't think was the intent of the original legislation.

It seems to me we ought to go back to a deregulated environment rather than go forth with a regulation for just one sport.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-127) was defeated upon reconsideration in Division I-A, 13-102-0.]

President Corrigan: Will there be any other motions for reconsideration? This will be the last opportunity for any others on the Presidential Agenda Day except the Division I proposals, which we have not completed yet.

As we began with the full session, I refer you to 38-A.

Now, we will go to 38-A on Page 96, NCAA Membership Restructuring.

NCAA Membership Restructuring— Establishment of Convention Program

Edward H. Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I would like to move Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

Our new structure that we adopted last year specified that calling the annual meeting or special Convention and setting the agenda or the program of those meetings rests with the responsibility of the Executive Committee.

Today, by a two-thirds vote, we set up an additional vehicle for getting items before the NCAA. That is what Prop 38 does. By petition of 100 institutions, an item can be brought before the NCAA for discussion. After today, we will not be able to have that opportunity without the approval of the Executive Committee.

We heard yesterday in our discussions regarding Proposal 7 about delaying or the importance of moving ahead and building our new home. A number of us feel very strongly that we need to get on with building that new home, but we want to make sure that it is designed with more than one door; that in effect there is an alternative strategy for bringing important business to the attention of this Association.

The Presidents Commission's document indicates that Proposal 38 is not supported by the Presidents Commission. In discussions that I have had with individuals on the Presidents Commission, since we began discussing

this item with Steve yesterday, a number of them thought there was another vehicle for getting issues before the Convention in future years other than the Executive Committee. There is a general need that is discussed and important to the whole Association. We now are in agreement in following a review of what was done last year. There is not another vehicle here other than the Executive Committee. Proposal 38 provides such a safeguard and I would hope that this body would provide that for its member. Thank you.

Kenneth A. Shaw (Syracuse University): This proposal is opposed by the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission. We see it as an effort to circumvent the new legislative process that was overwhelmingly voted in at the 1996 Convention.

As was stated earlier, the new process empowers the Executive Committee to call the Convention and to determine the agenda. The new process also provides an opportunity for its members to call for an override vote to allow the Convention to vote on Division I legislative actions. As we all know, compromises were struck in creating the structure that we voted in and in adjusting the legislative process. This proposal would undercut much of the efforts that went into achieving the appropriate balance and would do so even before the new structure has had an opportunity to be implemented. I urge you to join the Presidents Commission and the Council in opposing this legislation by defeating Proposal No. 38-A. Thank you.

Richard J. Ensor (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the original sponsors of this proposal, I would reiterate what Chancellor Shaw said. There was compromise struck in the process leading to the adoption of 35 and 36. As such, in the spirit of that compromise, the original sponsors will urge the Convention to vote "no."

Mr. Hammond: We appreciate in Divisions II and III that a compromise was reached in terms of alternate strategies that my colleague, President Shaw, talked about. For other divisions, that is not possible. So I would urge that they support it because the previous propositions that were referred to as a compromise only deal with Division I in providing access. I believe access is equally deserving in Division II and Division III.

[Parts A and C of Proposal No. 38 (Page A-98) were defeated, 344-375-43. Parts B, D and E were defeated in Division I, 67-221-3.]

NCAA Membership Restructuring—National Collegiate Championships

Robert M. Sweazy (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal creates a procedure for the establishment of a National Collegiate Championship in the new governance structure. Consistent with the current practice, each division acting through its governance structure will be able to approve the establishment of a National Collegiate Championship. The minimum sports sponsorship criteria necessary to establish the championship remains unchanged. Division I will continue to administer these championships. On behalf of the Council, I urge the support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-112) was adopted, 777-6-2.]

Amateurism—Media Activities

Larry R. Gerlach (University of Utah): On behalf of the Council and the

Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism, I move for adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation severely limits the opportunities for student-athletes to participate in the commercial media for entertainment activities. Proposal 59 would significantly increase opportunities for student-athletes in commercial radio, television, film, theater and writing projects by allowing such participation without reference to their athletics ability and reputation. Because it enhances student-athletes' welfare by affording athletes the same opportunities as other students, I urge your support of Proposal No. 59. Thank you.

Meredith P. Willard (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 59. Every student should have the opportunity to enhance his or her educational experience. Media activities are a way students can develop their talent and express themselves and grow as individuals.

However, because of our status as student-athletes, we are denied the opportunity to gain these educational experiences through media activity. The general student population is allowed this opportunity, but currently, student-athletes are denied this educational experience. There should be no distinction between the general student population and student-athletes. Therefore, we ask for your support for Proposal No. 59. Thank you.

[Parts A and D of Proposal No. 59 (Page A-125) were adopted, 718-13-1. Part B was adopted (Division I: 289-5-0; Division II: 187-3-0). Part C was adopted in Division III, 237-5-3.]

Financial Aid—Division I Men's Basketball

Morgan J. Burke (Purdue University): I move Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would increase grants-in-aid to men's basketball. The grant of one scholarship is not new to the membership. I underscore that the landscape in which we consider it this year has changed considerably.

Eligibility standards have been increased. The attrition to the NBA has also increased. Several years ago the grants-in-aid limits for men's sports were reduced by 10 percent. The men's basketball grants-in-aid limit was 15. A 10-percent reduction reduces it to 13.5, which is ultimately rounded down to 13. In 1994, there was a grant-limit study conducted by the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. It revealed that men's basketball is one of the men's top sports in the number of minority participants. Given the changed landscape, isn't it now appropriate to round up the scholarship limit to 14 and provide 300 plus opportunities, many of which would be afforded to, according to the 1994 study, to minority student-athletes?

It seems like a very small amount of money to be leveraged into a significant number of scholarship opportunities. In light of this, we would urge your support for Proposal No. 66. Thank you.

McKinley Boston (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I am a member of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee. I would like to support Proposal No. 66.

There are at least three issues that the Convention membership should reflect upon as we consider this legislation.

The first issue is related to the welfare of the game. The increase in attrition of student-athletes and prospective student-athletes to the NBA has

created additional challenges to field teams and recruit prospective student-athletes. Over the past seven years, in excess of 120 prospective student-athletes and underclassmen have left the collegiate ranks to pursue professional basketball, including 30 who entered the draft in 1996. The first seven draft picks of 1996 in the NBA draft were underclassmen. In addition to attrition, basketball teams are also affected by injury, illness and transfer. This proposal would allow for more flexibility for institutions to address these issues.

The second issue is athletics diversity. The NCAA participation summaries over previous years has consistently highlighted the decline of minorities in participation of intercollegiate athletics. We have been advised that there has been a slight growth in this trend this last year. This decline in perception and participation has occurred mainly because of the passage of the original Proposal 48 and parallel legislation, and because of a reduction in financial aid for football and basketball.

The passage of Proposal No. 66 would restore more than 300 new financial aid opportunities for male athletes. Of that number, we could expect, based on current participation averages, that a majority of those would go to black student-athletes, who again have clearly lost opportunities in our efforts to address academic and economic reform.

The third is economic fairness. As most of you know, a significant portion of the NCAA budget is financed from revenue generated by the NCAA men's basketball tournament and the television contract with CBS. The NCAA membership continues to benefit in a significant way, especially in its ability to function in a collegiate fashion to the committee structure and obviously from revenue sharing. It seems only reasonable that in the interest of the welfare of the game that benefits our institution in an economic manner, that we give back to the game that is so significant to the overall economic and social well-being of our institutions. I personally would hope that the membership would vote in support of Proposal No. 66.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I am a member of the Division I Board. I stand to oppose the proposition as presented for at least three reasons.

Number one, increasing the number of men's basketball scholarships for Division I from 13 to 14, as we view it, would clearly exacerbate any attempt to level the playing field between the "haves" and the "have nots" within the division. Placing one more scholarship ability for those in Division I merely provides some institutions that already have the multimillion dollar field-houses and weight rooms with one more weapon to attempt to recruit, if you will, the student-athlete who could and often does go to that campus and then basically sits on the bench.

Conversely, that same youngster could be skilled enough to be one of the starting five on a campus with less expensive equipment that some athletic programs have but produce a record of widely known alumni on only 13 scholarships.

Number two, the fact that some of the academy has become, if you will, a "farm" system for the NBA in no way justifies the sponsorship of this legislation relative to asserting that the absence of yet another scholarship is "handicapped" because of an "increase" in attrition of student-athletes and prospects to the NBA, thus further challenging the ability of the university to effectively field teams and recruit prospects in the program.

Thirdly, of course, is the age-old issue of the "stashing" of athletes. Would

you imagine the gall of that statement with regard to the issue of the desirability of seeking to get more flexibility by suggesting that this proposal would allow more flexibility for institutions to address these so-called situations?

No, this is poor legislation. It has been before us often in the past six years. I am urging strongly that we defeat it.

Robert W. Lawless (University of Tulsa): I am a member of the Presidents Commission. As has been pointed out by most of the speakers, this is not new legislation. It has come to be considered every year since the original legislation was passed.

I simply want to offer a reminder to those who have been at past Conventions that this year marks another attempt to directly reverse one of the core agenda items of the presidential reform. This would counter the goals of cost containment, and for almost all of the Division I members it would again increase the difficulty of achieving gender-equity goals. For a final time, I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 66.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): I have been asked to speak on behalf of the Division I Steering Committee and the Council in expressing opposition to Proposal No. 66.

As President Lawless has indicated, this proposal has been before the Convention before. This action to reduce the scholarships was taken as part of the reform package and was an effort to reduce cost and help balance scholarship equity in Division I. The Council and the Division I Steering Committee urge the defeat of Proposal No. 66.

William B. DeLauder (Delaware State University): I rise to oppose No. 66 for two compelling reasons. Two of them have already been mentioned. One is cost containment. This Convention has consistently over the years voted to try to reduce the cost of intercollegiate athletics. This is going in the opposite direction. We should not do that.

Secondly, it is a gender-equity issue. Our effort to reduce the number of scholarships for men's basketball, while retaining those for women athletes, was done in order to address the issue of gender equity. I urge this Convention to vote "no" on Proposal No. 66.

Charles A. "Tod" Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): Since Divisions II and III are just waiting around here to finish, is it possible to take the proposals that are referred to all divisions first and then perhaps dismiss II and III, and then come back and finish Division I? I know you do have to finish.

President Corrigan: Very good. We will continue through the remainder of the agenda. The Division II and III members should note that any action of any division can be rescinded by the entire body. We will consider all proposals for Presidential Agenda Day that both involve II and III members. So the answer to your question is, if you wish to leave, do so quietly. Thank you for being here.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-136) was defeated in Division I, 81-235-4.]

Initial Eligibility—Partial Qualifier—Division I

Carl W. Asp (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I move for adoption of No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

As we all know, there is an increase in academic standards with the 13 core courses to a 2.500. This created a narrow partial-qualifier window and

there are not many partial-qualifier student-athletes.

The proposal widens this window slightly to have a partial qualifier attend a four-year institution where they can receive quality academic support. The issue here is to allow the student-athlete access for financial aid in practice. It makes good academic sense to have a quality program. I urge your support of the partial-qualifier proposal.

Daron Dorsey (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Nevada, Las Vegas): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports the adoption of Proposal No. 67. We believe that it benefits the welfare of the student-athletes. Without this legislation, some student-athletes are denied the opportunity to attend a college because they do not meet the partial-qualifier standards and could not afford to pay the tuition.

Without financial aid, these gentlemen may not attend college and receive the benefits of a college education. In the past, a larger window of opportunity had to be established for student-athletes to become partial qualifiers to receive and participate on his or her respective team. The current rules have reduced the size of that window. We believe that the window should be opened more to allow student-athletes to meet the new partial-qualifier standards and receive the opportunities associated with a college education. The proposal does not lower initial-eligibility standards. It simply enables more student-athletes the opportunity to attend an institution on partial-qualifier status. Therefore, we support the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

John C. Hitt (Central Florida University): I speak in opposition to No. 67. It would roll back an increase in academic standards adopted only last year. I think it would be more prudent to continue to operate under the newly adopted standards, gain some experience with it, and if it needs modification, we can do so next year or the year after.

Jerry L. Kingston (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I, too, rise in opposition to Proposal 67. I believe that this would introduce yet additional complexity in what is already understood to be a fairly difficult and somewhat complex standard to administer.

I believe this would be inconsistent with the research results on which the original Proposal 16 was based. You will note that it has been opposed by the Academic Requirements Committee. It does, in fact, represent a significant reduction in academic standards. I encourage the delegates to defeat Proposal 67. Thank you.

Claire Van Ummersen (Cleveland State University): I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 67. This move to reduce standards at a time when we are beginning to see positive progress is unwarranted. It is a signal to young people in high school that it is okay to slack off.

We need to hold firm on standards to send the message that academics as well as athletics talent matter, that we are interested in recruiting student-athletes who can benefit from both academic and athletics programs at our colleges and universities.

Unidentified Delegate: I wish to speak in opposition to No. 67. The Commission and the Council spent considerable time and effort in discussing the initial-eligibility standards. To reduce the academic standards so quickly after they are established does not allow the Commission to establish any stability in this area.

If it is possible, I would like to call for the question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-137) was defeated in Division I, 86-230-6.]

Initial-Eligibility—Partial Qualifier —Division I

George A. Bohlen (University of Dayton): I move for adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

A partial qualifier, as currently defined, is an individual who has been successful in the classroom, having achieved a 2.500 GPA or higher in at least 13 core courses; but was not able to score high enough on the ACT or the SAT to achieve qualifier status.

The purpose of this Association, when we established the current initial-eligibility standards, was to attempt to define what we thought to be a reasonable minimum to successfully complete a baccalaureate degree and participate at the same time in intercollegiate athletics. Many argue that the use of the SAT and the ACT score eliminates prospective student-athletes who could, in fact, be successful. A recent lawsuit filed against the NCAA challenges the NCAA's use of standardized tests. Passage of this proposal could perhaps lessen the potential negative impact of alleged cultural bias in these tests by providing an avenue for students eliminated from qualifier status by their test score to regain the fourth year of eligibility by successfully completing the baccalaureate degree in four years.

This proposal provides an incentive for a partial qualifier to complete the degree requirements. It sends a signal that graduation is important. It is admitted in some cases that the initial-eligibility criteria may not, in fact, be an accurate predictor of a particular student-athlete's ability to be successful in academic work and intercollegiate athletics at the same time. We urge you to vote for this proposal.

Bridget Niland (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/State University of New York at Buffalo): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we urge you to support this proposal for three reasons. First, the way the rules stand now, we, the NCAA, treat students with past academic trouble inconsistently. I will give you an example. There are two high-school prospects. One barely meets player qualifications, barely meets them, but is considered a qualifier. He comes into college, he competes his first year. He or she does compete, but does not perform academically in the classroom and is considered not eligible for his or her second year of competition. They are still given four years of opportunity, although they didn't perform in the college classroom.

Now, you have player No. 2. He or she barely misses the initial-eligibility qualification. They come into college. They sit out their first year. They pay their price. They perform their first year. They perform their second year. They earn their college degree within four years. But we only give them three years of eligibility. That is inconsistent.

This student-athlete leads to my second point. This student-athlete has performed in the college classroom. Why do we continue to penalize them for something that occurred in high school when they weren't in your institution, when they maybe didn't have a particular learning problem identified? They come to your institution and they perform.

This leads to my final point, which is as CEOs and academic administrators, you are well aware that earning your four-year degree, earning your bachelor's degree in four years is not exactly an easy task. In this day and age, the general population can't even do this in four years. Surely, if a student-athlete, with all the other responsibilities they have, earned their bach-

elor's degree in four years, they should be rewarded, not penalized, for something that occurred back in high school. Thank you, and we urge your support of this proposal.

Brother Thomas J. Scanlan (Manhattan College): I speak against Proposal No. 68. On the one hand, I believe that it will undermine the initial-eligibility standard. But I speak because the NCAA has spoken publicly in terms of trying to discourage student-athletes from leaving early to the NFL and the NBA. We say we do that because we are interested in the student's education and don't want them to give up that year or two of education.

We make a point explicitly that we are not doing that on behalf of the quality of our athletics teams. We turn around and I undermine the credibility of that argument. A student who has earned his or her diploma should be congratulated, rewarded and allowed to move on with the rest of his life. Now we are encouraging them to stay and play on our teams.

Col. Thomas W. Davis (Virginia Military Institute): I rise in opposition to No. 68. We have heard this and similar proposals advanced for the last several years at this meeting. You often hear that we need to reward partial qualifiers who achieve. I think that by defeating Proposal 68, we are rewarding partial qualifiers who succeed.

I will tell you why. One, we reward them by allowing them to compete successfully for three years. We reward them and recognize them by the fact that they earned their degree in four years. The first person to graduate should be congratulated. We should shake the hand of the partial qualifier who finishes in four years. They are rewarded by the admiration they will get from the entire university community for being a partial qualifier who finishes in four years.

They will be rewarded by probably being far more attractive in the job market than they would if they get their degree and go back to school under very questionable conditions just to compete. They are in college to get their degree. If they get it in four years, they are going to be applauded, particularly if they came as partial qualifiers. I say by defeating Proposal 68, we truly reward the student-athlete.

Hoke L. Smith (Towson State University): I find the argument by the student representative very persuasive, but it did raise some questions. Are we supporting student-athletes to play four years or to get a degree?

I think the answer is to get a degree, not to play for four years. We were going to oppose this and will oppose it because we do have a question about what would be the academic content of the fifth year.

Ms. Niland: In response to the previous speakers, two points we would like to make.

First of all, in order for the partial qualifier to participate in the fourth year of eligibility, under this, they have to be a full-time student-athlete.

Second, what is wrong with wanting to continue on with your education, whether it be may be to pick up another major, maybe qualify yourself more in the job world? As it stands now, a bachelor's degree-plus is what it requires to get a really good job right now.

Our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly feels that you make a commitment to the student-athlete and bring him or her on to participate in your program. Surely, you want to reward them for their hard work and maybe your reward in your mind is to send them off on their way. They came to your institution to participate in your program and for the love of the

sport. We don't feel that you should deny them this opportunity after working so hard to overcome so many past academic problems. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee wants this. We are up here and that is what we are asking for. This is the reward. Thank you.

Mr. Bohlen: There are a lot of legitimate reasons to get on with their life at the university. For student-athletes getting a degree in a discipline other than education, say in history, and desiring to teach in grades one through 12, the student-athlete can after graduation take courses in education pursuant to a major in education in order to get a teaching certificate.

A student can take a second major to prepare for a career in a discipline other than the one in which he or she receives the degree. Many states will soon require accounting students to take a five-year curriculum. Most schools plan to use the work of the first four years for the baccalaureate degree and the fifth year to work on a master's, but it will be in accounting, in order to meet the state requirements.

Students can also attend graduate school to pursue the master's degree. Keep in mind that any student who does stay on beyond the baccalaureate must meet the continuing educational requirements and must be pursuing either a second major or a separate degree.

Norman Chervany (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mine is a point of information. Can we have the vote on 67? It might influence the vote on 68. That is a point of information.

President Corrigan: The vote on 67 was 86 yes and 230 no. It failed.

Mr. Chervany: With the acceptance of 68, I strongly support the amendment. I support and applaud the statement of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I would like to draw to your attention a literary analysis.

The vote against this proposal means that you subscribe more to the philosophy in the "Scarlet Letter" than the philosophy in the prodigal son or daughter. Thank you.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): We are successful in penalizing the partial qualifiers if they, in fact, do achieve a baccalaureate degree in four years, we would have been doing something very wonderful. I do not believe that if an athlete gets a baccalaureate degree in four years that many of them will opt to spend another year playing football or playing basketball. If they should opt to play football another year, I think that is wonderful. That means they will get another year of graduate education.

If you check the statistics on partial qualifiers in our society, very few of them, in fact, wind up with baccalaureate degrees and even less wind up going with one year of graduate school. So if through sports we could perpetuate that significant change, I think that that is well worth doing.

Therefore, I would urge this Convention to invest in the human potential of a partial qualifier and set the deck of cards in any way that it will be positive to influence that outcome. I urge your positive consideration of this proposition.

[Proposal No. 68 (Page A-138) was adopted in Division I, 173-145-7.]

President Corrigan: That completes the Presidential Agenda Day. However, since we had the previous window of reconsideration, Division I has acted on Proposals 62, 66, 67 and 68. These actions will stand unless they are reconsidered or rescinded during this session. We are now open for the window of reconsideration for those proposals only. If you wish to move for reconsideration, you must have voted on the prevailing side. A motion

to reconsider is available and will be voted on by roll call.

Are there any reconsiderations for this session? If not, Division I will reconvene tomorrow in this room. Thank you very much for your attention this afternoon.

[The general business session was recessed at 5:45 p.m.]

Tuesday Afternoon, January 14, 1997

The general business session was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with President Corrigan presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Corrigan: I call this meeting to order. There are a few procedural items we need to cover before we complete the main business of this session. You will recall at the opening business session it was indicated that there would be some motions today that we will need to act upon. They are procedural in nature and have to do with various reports.

REPORTS

For the record, we need to approve the reports of the sports and general committees of the Association. These reports are in the Annual Reports of the Association. At this point, a motion for approval of those reports would be in order.

[Note: Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of sports and standing committees, secretary-treasurer, Council, and Executive Committee.]

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

President Corrigan: Before we begin voting on the remaining legislation, I would like for Barbara Hick of St. Bonaventure University, chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee, to give the supplemental report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

Barbara Hick (St. Bonaventure University): President Corrigan and delegates, in addition to those individuals who on Sunday were recognized, we ask you to please add the following:

Administrators:

Leonidas Epps, Clark Atlanta
Jake Ford, Shaw
Rev. John Mannion, Seton Hall
Al McGilvray, Coker
Jack Rose, Cal State Long Beach
Allie White, Texas Christian

Student-Athletes:

Brenna Hansen, Utah State
Roderick McClure, Eastern Washington
Vanessa Reeves, Coker
Edward Rogers, St. Rose
Jennifer Walter, Wisconsin, Platteville

At this time we ask that you please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

President Corrigan: Thank you, Barbara.

You should have before you the listing of actions taken during the various divisions and subdivision business sessions today. Those actions will stand unless they are reconsidered or rescinded in this session. If you intend to call for reconsideration of an action, now is the time to do so. The window of reconsideration for actions taken earlier today is now open. Do we have any? I don't see anyone. Thank you. We can move on.

Now, we will move to the remaining items to be voted on at this session. Those items are listed on Page 239 of the Official Notice. We will start with the first six proposals, which compromise the consent package. I remind the delegates that these items stand as a package unless any delegate wishes to have one removed for action specifically by the Convention. At this point it would be appropriate for someone to move the adoption of the Consent Package.

Consent Package

Stanley P. Caine (Adrian College): On behalf of the Council, I move the consent package Proposal Nos. 1 through 6.

[Proposal Nos. 1-6 were approved as a consent package.]

Amateurism—Loan Against Future Earnings

Linda M. Bruno (Atlantic 10 Conference): I move Proposal No. 79.
[The motion was seconded.]

The sponsors believe the membership needs to carefully examine our amateurism role and recognize that there are some concerns relative to the wording of this proposal. We move to have this referred to the appropriate cabinet or committee in the governance structure. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-150) was referred to the new governance structures in Divisions I, II and III.]

Amateurism—Basketball Draft

Michael A. Tranghese (Big East Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate the current legislation that was intended to provide a one-time opportunity for a basketball player to test his market value by the draft and allow the individual, if he so chooses, to return to school.

The National Basketball Association has rendered the intent of this legislation useless by establishing their own rule, which does not allow the player to re-enter the draft if he returns to school. Such student-athlete's rights are retained by the team that originally drafted him. A player can determine his market value without entering the draft. Because of the NBA rule, a player cannot alter or enhance his draft position or his economic position by returning to school. For this reason, the intended purpose of the legislation has failed.

I would urge you to adopt Proposal 80 in order to prevent the National Basketball Association from taking advantage of the student-athlete and to have our coaches and players work together to determine the individual's value before determining whether or not they wish to enter the draft. I urge your support of this proposal.

Larry R. Gerlach (University of Utah): On behalf of the Council, the Division I Steering Committee and the Professional Sports Liaison Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 80.

The proposed legislation would not only rescind the current opportunity for athletes to determine their professional value and thus make an informed decision about whether to stay in school or pursue a career of professional basketball, but it also would render ineligible for intercollegiate athletics student-athletes who misjudge the professional potential and consequently are not drafted.

As such, it is unduly restrictive and punitive. This year, six student-athletes declared themselves eligible for the draft then rescinded their declarations prior to the draft. All are significant contributors to the school's programs this season. The proposed legislation would have rendered them ineligible and thus have a negative impact on their athletics and academic development. During the past year, the Professional Sports Liaison Committee has worked with the NBA to reach a reasonable accommodation regarding the draft.

The result is Proposal 81. I urge defeat of Proposal 80 and support of Proposal No. 81, which makes current legislation more restrictive for drafted athletes yet provides flexibility to those not drafted.

[Proposal No. 80 (Page A-151) was defeated.]

Amateurism—Basketball Draft

Larry R. Gerlach (University of Utah): On behalf of the Council and the Professional Sports Liaison Committee, I move Proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would modify existing legislation by rendering ineligible for intercollegiate basketball competition athletes who enter a professional basketball league draft and are subsequently drafted by a professional team.

Those athletes who overestimated their professional potential and thus were not drafted or rescinded their draft declarations prior to the draft would retain the option of returning to school and participating in athletics. Current legislation, which permits student-athletes who enter the draft to opt within 30 days following the draft to return to school, was enacted because participation in the draft was the only means for the basketball player to determine their professional value. The National Basketball Association has agreed to establish in time for the 1997 NBA draft an advisory committee similar to that created several years ago by the National Football League to give undergraduates an accurate and realistic sense of their draft potential.

Because the NBA advisory committee will enable basketball players to make an informed decision about whether to remain in school or pursue a professional career, it follows that a decision to enter the draft constitutes a considered and deliberate choice to turn professional. I urge your support of Proposal No. 81.

[Proposal No. 81 (Page A-152) was adopted.]

Amateurism—Disabling Injury or Illness

Yvonne L. Slatton (University of Iowa): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Infractions, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 82.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this legislation is to clarify that a student-athlete must provide documentation of any insurance policy regarding disabling injury or illness regardless of whether a loan is used to pursue the policy.

NCAA bylaws allow student-athletes to secure loans to pay for an insurance policy against disabling injury or illness. Current bylaws require the student-athlete to report the loan and file documents regarding the loan and the insurance policy with the member institution.

Some confusion seems to have arisen as to whether the current bylaws require a student-athlete to file insurance documents with the institution when the student-athlete obtains disabling injury or illness insurance, but does not use a loan to pay for the insurance. The Committee on Infractions believes that the current bylaws were intended to ensure that institutions are aware of all insurance policies student-athletes obtain against disabling injury or illness regardless of whether a loan is used to pay for the policy.

This proposal clarifies that an institution must receive from the student-athlete documentation of any injury policy against the disabling injury or illness regardless of the source of the funds used to pay for the policy. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 82 (Page A-152) was adopted.]

Amateurism—Disabling Injury or Illness

Mr. Gerlach: On behalf of the Council and the Professional Sports Liaison Committee, I move Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

The practice of sports agents conferring improper benefits on student-athletes in the form of providing assistance in obtaining disability insurance policies represents potential for abuse. Current legislation requires that copies of loan documents be filed with the office of the director of athletics only if the collateral on the loan is obtained to purchase the policy on the student-athlete's future earnings.

Proposal 83 would require all loan documents to be filed with the athletics director regardless of the source of the collateral used to purchase the disability insurance. As such, it would both assist institutions in monitoring an area of significant agent abuse and deter student-athletes from entering into improper loan agreements that could not only jeopardize their athletics eligibility but also result in future financial hardship. I urge your support of Proposal No. 83.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-154) was adopted.]

Promotional Activities—Expenses Beyond 100 Miles

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): As a member of the NCAA Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

This summer, a student-athlete chose to be a member of the United States Olympic swimming team and was prevented from receiving legitimate and normal expenses to participate in a United States Olympic Committee media summit because current NCAA rules prohibit the receipt of such expenses if the promotional activity is out of state and beyond a 100-mile radius of a student-athlete's institution.

Shortly after this incident, the USOC asked the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee to consider changing NCAA rules in this area. After discussing various alternatives, the committee agreed that a student-athlete should be permitted to receive such expenses from institutional, conference, charitable, educational or nonprofit agencies regardless of the distance from the

member institution's campus provided that, number one, the activity is related to certain specified national and international competitions.

Number two, the activity is not more than one calendar year prior to the start of the competition. Number three, existing NCAA restrictions related to promotional activities also apply. These restrictions include written approval from the director of athletics, no missed class time and no use of the student-athlete's name or picture to promote a personal product or venture. The committee is convinced that the limited exception created by this proposal contains sufficient safeguards to preclude such situations from being abused. On behalf of the Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 84. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 84 (Page A-155) was adopted.]

Professional Sports Organizations—Sponsorship of Youth Terms

Larry R. Gerlach (University of Utah): On behalf of the Council and the Professional Sports Liaison Committee, I move Proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

It has come to the attention of the Professional Sports Liaison Committee and the legislative services staff that the long-standing and widespread financial support of the youth sports programs by professional sports teams and organizations technically violates the Association's amateurism laws and threatens the eligibility of prospective student-athletes participating in those programs.

Given current legislation, it will be impermissible, for example, for Major League Baseball to continue to provide funds for the purchase of bats, balls uniforms and other equipment to, among others, the American Legion baseball leagues, the National Junior College World Series and the RBI Program—a recent initiative to revitalize youth baseball in America's inner cities.

The proposed legislation seeks to codify long-standing practices that are proven to be beneficial to youth sports without compromising the NCAA amateurism legislation and to adopt a "common sense" approach to the financial support of youth programs from professional sports teams and organizations. Accordingly, individuals will be able to participate on a youth team that receives funding from a professional sports team or organization without jeopardizing their future eligibility, so long as that team is amateur in nature and the sponsorship moneys are not designated for a particular individual. I urge your support of Proposal No. 85. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 85 (Page A-156) was adopted.]

Permissible Expenses—Meal-Allowance Limitation

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): On behalf of the Colonial Athletic Association, I move Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

During the vacation period when the student-athletes are required to remain on campus for practice and competition, the institution is restricted to providing meal allowances based on campus dining hall rates, which oftentimes are significantly lower than reasonable meal costs in the community.

This proposal would permit the use of an institution's established meal allowance for off-campus dining, which we believe to be a more appropriate and fair figure. This proposal is supported by the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-158) was adopted.]

Financial Aid—Exempted Government Grants

R. Elaine Dreidame (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move Proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

Welfare benefits from the state or federal government are already included in the computation of student-athletes' expected family contributions. So a student-athlete, who receives financial aid in programs such as aid to dependent children and food stamps, should not have those benefits counted toward the student-athlete's maximum financial aid limit, too.

This proposal will allow welfare benefits from state or federal government to be included among the government grants currently exempted when determining the permissible amount of a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid or cost of attendance. We urge you to adopt this legislation.

[Proposal No. 89 (Page A-160) was adopted.]

De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

Robert J. Baugh (Eastern Kentucky University): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 98-H and I.

[The motion was seconded.]

At last year's Convention and at this Convention, the membership adopted legislation that eliminated the responsibility of each institution to declare a prospect or student-athlete ineligible during inconsequential violations.

Violations of this type do not result in a benefit being provided to the prospect or student-athlete and the institution seldom gains a recruiting or competitive advantage. No. 98-H and I are similar issues. Again, it is important to note violations included in this proposal must be reported to the NCAA enforcement staff and that one or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed upon the institution. The only difference is that the eligibility of the prospects or student-athletes will not be affected by actions over which they have no control. The Eligibility Committee strongly urges your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Parts H and I of Proposal No. 98 (Page A-169) were adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—College Professional Contests

Melissa L. Conboy (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 143.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the result of the Legislative Review Committee's examination of Bylaw 17 to identify areas in which the rules could be deregulated. This proposal seeks to eliminate the prohibition on institutions scheduling contests in conjunction with professional sporting events.

At last year's Convention, the membership adopted legislation to permit institutions to hold a contest between two professional teams as a fund-raising activity. This is a logical exemption of that legislation. Allowing institutions to schedule intercollegiate contests in conjunction with professional events will provide an avenue for some institutions to increase attendance and to generate much-needed revenues.

The committee notes that the prohibition against professional teams making direct contributions to an institution's athletics department would remain

in effect. We urge you to join the Council in its support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 143 (Page A-226) was adopted.]

Ethical Conduct—Gambling Activities

Larry R. Gerlach (University of Utah): On behalf of the Council and the Professional Sports Liaison Committee, I move Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

In recent years, coverage in the print and electronic media has provided evidence of the dangers of gambling to the personal welfare of individuals and to the integrity of college sports competition.

At last year's Convention, this body adopted a proposal that extended for student-athletes only the legislative ban on gambling to include betting on professional sports as well as on intercollegiate athletics competitions. It was pointed out then that the amendment was both inconsistent and exclusive inasmuch as the problems associated with sports gambling were not limited to student-athletes, but applied to athletics personnel generally. Accordingly, Proposal No. 130 extends the prohibition on gambling on sports contests, exclusive of horse racing and dog racing to athletics staff members, including coaches. In the spirit of legislative consistency and in recognition of the increasing problem of sports gambling, I urge your support for Proposal No. 130.

[Proposal No. 130 (Page A-210) was adopted.]

Conduct of Athletics Personnel—Tobacco Products

Dennis Wilson (Auburn University): I am chair of the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. On behalf of the committee and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 134.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was included in the set of proposals submitted to the NCAA Council as part of the competitive safeguards committee's plan to heighten the awareness of the membership regarding violating the tobacco ban.

Proposal No. 134 has the full support of the Council. A few years ago, this Convention approved legislation submitted by the competitive safeguards committee that banned the use of tobacco products at collegiate practices and competitions. That legislation also established penalties for student-athletes found to be using tobacco products at these events. It did not establish sanctions for game personnel, including coaches, athletic trainers, managers, et cetera. This proposal rectifies this situation.

This legislation establishes a process in which applicable sports committees establish uniform penalties for tobacco use by game personnel. The committee believes that such will hold game personnel to the same high standards as the student-athletes. As chair of this committee, I ask your support of this legislation.

Gene Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I serve on the NCAA Football Rules Committee and the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. As a coach and administrator, I am in full support of Proposal No. 134.

The inconsistency in our tobacco legislation allows for a penalty for the student-athletes but not for game personnel. This proposal will address the inconsistency that currently exists by requiring the imposition of uniform penalties as determined by the applicable sports committees. I urge your

support of this and all the committee legislation to deter the use of tobacco and other drugs in the athletics setting.

[Proposal No. 134 (Page A-214) was adopted.]

Positive Drug Test—Non-NCAA Athletics Organization

Dennis Wilson (Auburn University): With all due respect to the Council, which withdrew its support for Proposal No. 135, I would like to move for consideration of Proposal No. 135.

[The motion was seconded.]

As chair of the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, I want to briefly explain the committee's intent in sponsoring this legislation. Since the inception of the NCAA drug-testing program, coaches primarily in the sports of track and field and swimming have been concerned that student-athletes who have tested positive through the drug-testing programs, such as USOC, U.S. Track and Field, U.S. Swimming, et cetera, be eligible to compete in NCAA championship events. Although no one knows how many times such athletes have competed in NCAA championships, the coaches have been concerned that when it does happen, it compromises the integrity of the sport and the championship. I will say that the Drug Education and Testing Subcommittee believes that if coaches chose not to recruit known drug users, no legislation would be necessary.

Nevertheless, the subcommittee, at the request of coaches, has spent a considerable amount of time studying the issue. This proposal reflects the results of that process. The competitive safeguards committee believes that this proposal does nothing more than establish a very narrow drug-testing procedure for the use of performance-enhancing substances. The committee recognizes the concerns that many of you may have about the integrity of some of the other drug-testing programs administered in the sport. The committee shares these concerns. However, this legislation does not call for institutions to apply NCAA sanctions for positive drug tests generated through other testing programs. Instead, it merely requires if a student-athlete has a positive drug test from a designated organization, the NCAA will conduct its own drug test prior to the athlete's intercollegiate athletics participation.

The committee wants the membership to be clear on these issues. First, it is not the committee's intent to include drugs other than those specifically banned by the NCAA. Two, drug tests administered by NCAA schools and conferences are not affected by this legislation. Number three, the results of the NCAA drug testing will continue to be handled at the same level of confidentiality that currently exists. On behalf of the committee, I ask for approval of Proposal No. 135.

Edward Leland (Stanford University): I rise on behalf of the NCAA Council. I want to note that the Council has withdrawn its sponsorship and support of this legislation. In fact, the Council has again reviewed the issues related to this legislation and has made an attempt to withdraw it.

The Council is concerned about a variety of issues, some ethical, some legal, some procedural, that causes us to believe this is not good legislation this time, although well intended. Because of these and many other questions, the Council urges that this legislation not be adopted.

Mr. Carpenter: I am sorry to hear that has happened. As a member of the Drug Education and Drug-Testing Subcommittee of the NCAA committee on competitive safeguards, we urge your support of No. 135.

I have been involved in expanded discussions of this legislation in our committee meetings. Since that time, it was proposed by various coaches groups. Numerous variations of the legislation were reviewed by NCAA committees, including the Eligibility and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. NCAA legal counsel also assisted the committee as we studied the options available to us.

The legislation calls for the NCAA Executive Committee to authorize the methods used for drug testing student-athletes who report positive drug tests from organizations such as the U.S. Olympic Committee and the national sports federations. If this proposal passes, the competitive safeguards committee will develop those methods, including a list of those organizations whose results will be recognized. I can assure you that it is the committee's intent to keep this for-cause testing program very narrow and in focus. Please support No. 135.

Yvonne L. Slatton (University of Iowa): I just have a point of clarification for someone who may be on the competitive safeguards committee to answer. Does it matter how long ago they tested positive? Is it 10 years ago or two years ago?

Mr. Wilson: The legislation doesn't speak to that, so there obviously is no time limitation.

Lauren E. Anderson (University of Rhode Island): I am chair of the men's and women's track and field committee. The track and field committee urges the support of Proposal No. 135. It is necessary that the NCAA send consistent messages about drugs to enhance performance and allowing athletes to test positive in other programs to compete. Without a question, in our events, they do a disservice to those who train and compete free of drugs.

The sport of track and field has been negatively affected by the use of performance-enhancing drugs, both perceived and actual. The NCAA has done much to improve the situation to aggressive in-competition and out-of-competition drug testing. This proposal will add to those aggressive steps—if it is taken both educationally and in drug testing—to deter the use of performance-enhancing drugs in the collegiate track and field world. We need to be clear, that testing positive by another athletics drug-testing entity, such as the USA Track and Field or the IAAF, which is the international governing body for track and field, constitutes probable cause for NCAA drug testing.

This proposal merely establishes that principle. The competitive safeguards committee and the coaches are not asking for changes in the current drug-testing program. This legislation will not in any way affect the high level of confidentiality, security and quality that exists in the NCAA drug-testing program.

We cannot guarantee that every competitor in NCAA events is drug free. However, we can provide a protocol for probable cause in NCAA testing for those cases when athletes are known to have tested positive in other programs. We owe this to the student-athletes who have made the right choice to train and compete without the use of any banned enhancing-performing drugs. The track and field coaches are in support of this legislation.

Robert J. Frank (Oregon State University): Would a high school be identified as an athletics organization?

Mr. Wilson: The competitive safeguards committee will identify those organizations, but that has never been one mentioned. It has been those

major ones, like the USOC, USA Track and Field, and U.S. Swimming. That does not speak directly to that.

Mr. Frank: I asked because I think most of us in this room know there are a number of high schools around the country that do that. I would suggest that we have an answer to that question, particularly if we are going to be asking students to sign a form. We aren't clear about what might be considered an athletics organization.

The legislation, as stated, just says any other athletics organization. When you vote, you need to assume that is any other athletics organization, including high school.

[Part A of Proposal No. 135 (Page A-214) was adopted. Part B was adopted in Divisions I, II and III. Parts C and D adopted.]

Roy Kramer (Southeastern Conference): Mr. President, I realize that I am probably out of order, but...

President Corrigan: You are. (Laughter)

Mr. Kramer: ...very shortly, you will no longer be our president. Your power is waning. Therefore, I take privilege to speak at this time before the delegates begin to leave. I would hope that this organization would permit me to offer a few words of congratulations, commendation and appreciation to you, Gene Corrigan, for your leadership during this Convention, and most of all over the past two very difficult years as we have shepherded ourselves through this period of transition during which we have taken the most significant steps in restructuring in the long history of this organization.

As the future of the NCAA unfolds under this new structure, all of us will continue to be deeply indebted to you for your patience, your concern, and most of all, your firm hand at the helm.

On a more personal basis, as you not only leave this position with the NCAA, but also later this year as the commissioner of the Atlantic Coast Conference, those of us who have been a part of intercollegiate athletics over the past three or four decades deeply appreciate your wisdom, your insight, your warm Irish wit and your friendly persuasion that has impacted not only the rich tradition of the college sports world, but each of us as individuals to consider one of life's richest privileges, your friendship.

We congratulate you and wish you and Lena many, many days in the sun with no amendments, no voting machines, no Councils, no faculty representatives, no athletics directors, no presidents and no commissioners, and only one fairway, friendly greens, good health and happy memories. Congratulations.

[*Note: The delegates extended a prolonged standing ovation.*]

President Corrigan: Thank you very much. I hope my wife heard all that. (Laughter) Thank you, Roy. I can't tell you how much that means. I appreciate it so much. This is a very difficult thing to come in and sit through all these. I have told people for years there has never been a better group of people to handle things as well as you do. I thank you for that.

It brings us back to Proposal No. 137, which we can't let go of.

Championships—Minimum Sponsorship Criteria—Olympic Sports

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Ohio State University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 137.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over the past several years, we have made wonderful strides in intercollegiate athletics, the growth of women's athletics, the opening of many oppor-

tunities for many people has been a great thing. We have created emerging sports, but in the process, there has also been an unfortunate byproduct—the creation of endangered sports, sports that have been the proud part of NCAA athletics and have provided many wonderful opportunities and moments with great, great championship competition.

They also have provided some of our truly great Olympic moments. Over the years, the NCAA has produced terrific student-athletes who have gone on to represent their country with great, great distinction. I urge the membership to support Proposal No. 137.

This is a time to encourage diversity in athletics in all ways, including a broadly based spectrum of sports. I urge the adoption of No. 137.

Wright Waters (Southern Conference): On behalf of the Executive Committee, we urge you to defeat Proposal No. 137. The same proposal was defeated by the membership in the 1996 Convention and the Executive Committee remains opposed to it.

You may recall that last year the Executive Committee supported and the Membership Committee adopted a proposal that created a moratorium on the discontinuation of any NCAA championships through 1998-99 regardless of the sponsorship numbers. We believe that provides sufficient time for each division in the new restructured Association to evaluate its minimal sponsorship criteria, revenue strengths and sponsorship, and determine whether it wants to propose new criteria.

Proposal No. 137 is lacking in two respects, in our opinion. First, it would not protect all NCAA championships, only those in Olympic sports. Second, as an Executive Committee, we don't think that it is appropriate to eliminate all minimal sponsorships requirements completely and have no minimum basis for conducting a championship. We urge you to defeat Proposal No. 137.

Charles M. Neinas (College Football Association): A point of special privilege. I would like to second Roy Kramer's comments. You have not only helped the NCAA, Gene, but you have helped all of us in intercollegiate athletics. We thank you very much.

Now, I rise to speak against the Executive Committee on the last item of business on the last Convention. I realize many institutions have probably made the decision to vote on this matter prior to coming to this Convention, so the only thing I ask is to please consider this with an open mind.

Whom did we honor this week? Did we honor him because he was an end at Georgia or a lawyer in Atlanta? No, we honored Billy Payne because he had the vision to bring to this country and the city of Atlanta the 100th anniversary of the Olympic Games.

The school-college community has been the primary contributor to our Olympic success through the years. We have talked today and we have talked all week about aiding the student-athlete. Unfortunately, there are some student-athletes who may not be able to gain the glory of participating in National Collegiate Athletic Association competitions, because for reasons beyond their own, their sport has been reduced in terms of size.

Let's take a look at what it costs. According to the Annual Report, and I assume this is accurate, the membership has accepted it, the NCAA showed a surplus on August 31, 1996, of \$19,623,253. What did it cost the organization to conduct men's gymnastics? That was \$146,000. What about men's volleyball? That was \$28,000. What about water polo? That was \$81,000. That is a net cost of \$255,000 when the Association enjoys a surplus in excess

of \$18 million. What about wrestling? Eighty institutions, 328 athletes, produce gross revenue in excess of \$1 million. I submit for the good of athletes and the Olympic Committee, please support No. 137.

Clayton W. Chapman (Eastern College Athletic Conference): I also rise to urge the delegates to support Proposal No. 137. Many of the important proposals of this Convention beyond restructuring continue to address the welfare of the student-athlete and our role as athletics administrators in living up to the fundamental purposes of the Association, including promoting and conducting national championship events.

Unfortunately, as we all know, some of our national championships, particularly those in Olympic sports, are in danger of being eliminated. It is true there is a moratorium in place that will protect these championships, but only through the 1998-99 academic year. It is also true that efforts are underway in cooperation with the USOC to provide a central funding to enhance continued institutional sponsorship of these sports at the highest level. But it is clear that something more must be done to preclude the possibility of elimination of these championships for Olympic sports in the near future.

Proposal 137 presents this challenge to the Association and, therefore, to this Convention, to do our part in furthering the efforts of the USOC by giving our Olympic sports athletes like those we honored during this Convention the support and the incentive they deserve. Prop 137 ensures that our best collegiate student-athletes will continue to have the competitive opportunities at the highest level while pursuing their undergraduate education and their quest for Olympic gold. I urge your support of this proposal, which is so important to our student-athletes in Olympic sports.

Richard M. Bay (San Diego State University): I rise also in support of No. 137. A number of us in this room have served on the USOC/NCAA Task Force to help protect endangered sports. I think a vote against 137 would be a setback in that area at a time when the USOC and the NCAA are beginning to work better together. I urge the support of 137. Thank you.

Kathy Scanlan (College Gymnastics Association): I also serve as president of USA Gymnastics, the national governing body, and am a member of the USOC charged with the ultimate responsibility of preparing athletes for international and Olympic competition.

Our charge is to continue gymnastics for young people in early programs through their high-school careers to those very, very few elite athletes who will ultimately represent us in international competition. I cannot stress to you enough on behalf of our national governing body and on behalf of each national governing body whose support is included in the NCAA, the importance in that continuum from a childhood sport to an Olympic champion and the role of collegiate athletics programs.

It seems to me two important things have happened since last year when you considered this legislation. The first has already been mentioned. That is, of course, the work of the USOC and the NCAA task force and the adoption of the funds for that program at our October 1996 board meeting and its consideration for the implementation at our meeting next month in Philadelphia. Most importantly, we are reminded from the 1996 Olympics that Olympic planning occurred in a four-year cycle. While we very much appreciate the moratorium and the continuing of championships that are endangered through 1999, we are already preparing for 2000, for 2004 and 2008.

I cannot stress to you enough the importance of that four-year cycle. We are reminded in my own sport of gymnastics, when we look at our teams that do so very well in Atlanta. On the men's side, five of the seven men who experienced the greatest improvement of any gymnastics team in the world, rising from ninth to fifth, were NCAA athletes. All of the coaching staff were coaches from the NCAA. On the women's side, because of the fondness for younger people, they are not NCAA athletes. I can tell you this, that of the seven women who won gold medals, at the point they stood on that stand, four of them had retained their NCAA eligibility. Perhaps the most visible female athlete of the game, Karrie Strugg, was rooting for and looking forward to an NCAA career.

It wasn't until opportunity smashed down her door that she hesitated another two weeks, because just like her sister before, she had wanted to compete in the NCAA and help through the 1996 Olympics. Also, when we look at the coaching staff, so many of our coaches and administrators come from the NCAA ranks. It is so vitally important not only to the student-athletes but for the coaches for continuation of Olympic sports. I urge your adoption of Proposal No. 137. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 137 (Page A-219) was adopted.]

President Corrigan: After having been here so many times before, I thought I heard as compelling an argument as I have ever heard, including from our friend Chuck, that CFA guy.

We are basically at the end of our business. I think there is one group we need to honor here. When the NCAA staff was handed restructuring, it meant double time for a lot of them. I wish we could all stand up and give them a great hand for what they have accomplished in this organization last year.

[Note: The delegates extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

President Corrigan: Is there any further business to come before this meeting? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

[The general business session was adjourned at 3 p.m.]

Appendix A

91st Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION

BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.10, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption by the Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that were submitted with an immediate effective date are noted with an asterisk (*) by the effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1996-97 NCAA Manual.] All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 91st annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments-to-amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 91st ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 6	Consent Package
7 through 78	Presidents Commission Grouping
79 through 89	Amateurism/Benefits/Financial Aid
90 through 98; 142	Eligibility
99 through 116	Recruiting
117 through 129;	
143 through 149	Playing and Practice Seasons
130 through 134	Personnel
135 through 141	General

Consent Package

Proposals 1 through 6 are offered as a "consent package" of amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The

Legislative Proposals

A-1

remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption inasmuch as the package contains certain dominant provisions.

NO. 1 (NO. 2-52) REPLACEMENT FOR U.S. NATIONAL OR OLYMPIC TEAM COACHES

Intent: To permit a coach to be temporarily replaced when that coach takes a leave of absence to participate on or to coach either the U.S. national team or U.S. Olympic team, provided the replacement is limited to a one-year period and the coach performs no recruiting or other duties on behalf of the institution.

Bylaws: Amend 11.7.1.1.1 by adding new 11.7.1.1.1.3, page 87, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.1.1.1 Countable Coach. An athletics department staff member must count against coaching limits as soon as the individual participates (in any manner) in the coaching of the inter-collegiate team in practice, games or organized activities directly related to that sport, including any organized staff activity directly related to the sport.

[11.7.1.1.1.1 and 11.7.1.1.1.2 unchanged.]

"11.7.1.1.1.3 Replacement For U.S. National or Olympic Team Coaches. Subject to Council approval, an institution may replace a coach temporarily or on a limited basis when that coach takes a leave of absence to participate on or to coach either the U.S. national team or U.S. Olympic team, provided the replacement is limited to a one-year period and the coach who is replaced performs no recruiting or other duties on behalf of the institution."

[11.7.1.1.1.3 renumbered as 11.7.1.1.1.4, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Bylaw 11.7.1.1.1.2 currently permits the Council (or NCAA Administrative Committee acting for the Council) to approve replacements of an institutional coaching staff member if the coach is unable to perform any or all of his or her duties due to extenuating circumstances. However, the Administrative Committee, in reviewing waiver requests over the years, has not considered participation on or coaching the national or Olympic team to be an extenuating circumstance. The committee believes that an institution should not be penalized for encouraging its coaches to take advantage of such opportunities to enhance their coaching skills.

Action: Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

NO. 2 (NO. 2-67) PERMISSIBLE RECRUITERS — PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN OF PROSPECT

Intent: To permit a coaching staff member who is the parent or legal guardian of a prospect to observe any activity (e.g., practices, contests, camps) involving that prospect.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.3, page 115, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.2.3 General Exceptions. This regulation is not applicable to:

[13.1.2.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Coach Who is Prospect's Parent or Legal Guardian. Recruiting contact and evaluation limitations do not apply to a coaching staff member who is the parent (or legal guardian) of a participant in the competition **any activity** being observed (e.g., **practices, contests or camps**), provided the attendance by the coaching staff member at such competition **activity** does not involve any personal contact with any other participant **participating prospect** in the competition."

[13.1.2.3-(c) through 13.1.2.3-(g) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: A coaching staff member who is the parent or legal guardian of a prospect should be allowed to observe any athletics activity involving his or her child, including practices and camps. This proposal is not a significant change from the existing legislation and the restriction against personal contact with any other prospect ensures that no unfair recruiting advantage will be gained.

Action: Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

NO. 3 (NO. 2-72) RECRUITING — COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS — CONFERENCE TOURNAMENTS

Intent: To permit conferences to provide to NCAA Youth Education Through Sports (YES) clinic participants complimentary admissions to attend conference tournaments.

Bylaws: Amend 13.5 by adding new 13.5.4, page 126, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.5.4 Complimentary Admissions — Conference Tournaments. Conferences approved to host an NCAA YES clinic in conjunction with their conference championship may provide complimentary admissions to YES clinic participants to attend the conference championship."

[13.5.4 and 13.5.5 renumbered as 13.5.5 and 13.5.6, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (National Youth Sports Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The YES conference clinics are conducted to promote youth sports participation. Attendance at a conference championship in conjunction with clinic activities is an important aspect of the overall experience.

Action: Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

NO. 4 (NO. 2-83) CAMPS AND CLINICS — NYSP AND YES

Intent: To confirm that it is permissible for coaches and student-athletes at member institutions to participate in the National Youth Sports Programs (NYSP) and NCAA Youth Education through Sports (YES) programs and that such participation is exempt from NCAA restrictions on camps and clinics.

Bylaws: Amend 13.13.3, page 142, as follows:

[Federated provisions, all divisions, divided vote]

“13.13.3 FCA Camps and Conferences, **NYSP and YES Clinics.** Camps, **clinics** and conferences conducted by the Fellowship of Christian Athletes **or as part of the National Youth Sports Program (NYSP) and Youth Education through Sports (YES) program** are exempt from NCAA restrictions on camps and clinics.”

Source: NCAA Council (National Youth Sports Program Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Currently, through interpretations and waivers, coaches and student-athletes are permitted to participate in the National Youth Sports Program and the Youth Education through Sports program without regard to NCAA restrictions on camps and clinics. However, it is confusing to institutional representatives. Therefore, inclusion in Bylaw 13.13.3 would provide documentation for institutions regarding the participation of their coaches and/or student-athletes in these youth programs.

Action: Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

NO. 5 (NO. 2-101) ELIGIBILITY — OUTSIDE COMPETITION

Intent: To eliminate the requirement that the NCAA Council approve waivers of specified national and international outside competitions.

[Note: Editorial revisions, primarily in NCAA Bylaw 17, will be made as necessary throughout the NCAA Manual.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.7.5, page 191, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“14.7.5 Exceptions to Outside-Competition Regulations. The following exceptions to the outside-competition regulations are permitted.

“14.7.5.1 In All Sports:

[14.7.5.1-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) Olympic Games. A student-athlete may participate in the official Olympic Games, *and* in final tryouts that directly qualify competitors for the Olympic Games, **and in officially recognized competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic Games tryouts.**

“(c) Official Pan American Games Tryouts and Competition. A student-athlete may participate in official Pan American Games tryouts and competition.

“(d) U.S. National Teams. A student-athlete may participate in official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate national governing bodies of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for the student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation or, for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport).

“(e) Official World Championships and World Cup Tryouts and Competition. A student-athlete may participate in official World Championships and World Cup tryouts and competition.

“(f) Multisport Events. A student-athlete may participate in officially recognized state and national multisport events (including the U.S. Olympic Festival and U.S. Olympic Festival tryouts) sanctioned by the Council.

“14.7.5.2 Additional Exceptions for Basketball Only:

[14.7.5.2-(a) through 14.7.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) United States vs. U.S. National Teams. A student-athlete may participate in the United States against U.S. national teams.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.7.5 by adding new 14.7.5.3, page 191, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

“14.7.5.3 National-Team Criteria. The criteria for determining a national team *for the granting of waivers* under this regulation are set forth in 30.8.1.”

C. Bylaws: Amend 14.7.6, page 191, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“14.7.6 Waivers for Outside Competition

“14.7.6.1 For All Sports. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, shall have the authority to waive the provisions of 14.7.1 and 14.7.2 to permit student-athletes to participate in the following, for all sports:

“(a) Official Pan American Games tryouts and competition;

“(b) Officially recognized competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic Games tryouts;

“(c) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate national governing bodies of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for the student-athlete representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation or, for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport);

“(d) Official World Championships and World Cup tryouts and competition; and

“(e) Officially recognized state and national multisport events (including the U.S. Olympic Festival and U.S. Olympic Festival tryouts) sanctioned by the Council.

“14.7.6.2 Additional Waivers for Basketball Only. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, shall have the authority to waive the provisions of 14.7.2 to permit student-athletes to participate in:

“(a) The United States against United States national teams, and

“(b) Other international competition that is sanctioned by the Council and is scheduled during a period other than the involved institution's intercollegiate basketball season.”

D. Bylaws: Amend 14.7.6.3, page 191, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

“14.7.6.3 National-Team Criteria. The criteria for determining a national team for the granting of waivers under this regulation are set forth in 30.8.1.”

Source: NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Currently, an institution must submit a waiver request to the national office (for approval by the executive director on behalf of the Administrative Committee) each time a student-athlete wishes to participate in specified national and international competitions. This proposal would simplify the process and reduce paperwork by permitting institutions to approve student-athletes participating in specified outside competitions.

Action: Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

NO. 6 (NO. 2-112) PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES — NATIONAL STUDENT-ATHLETE DAY

Intent: To permit an institution to pay actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in activities and events associated with National Student-Athlete Day.

Bylaws: Amend 16.10.1 by adding new 16.10.1.9, page 246, renum-

bering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

“16.10.1.9 National Student-Athlete Day. An institution may pay actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in activities and events associated with National Student-Athlete Day, provided such activities and events are conducted either in the state in which the institution is located or in Washington D.C., as part of a national celebration.”

[16.10.1.9 and 16.10.1.10 renumbered as 16.10.1.10 and 16.10.1.11, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: National Student-Athlete Day is a significant event recognizing student-athletes who participate in intercollegiate athletics. As the Association continues to address student-athlete welfare issues and encourage more students to participate in intercollegiate athletics, it is important that student-athletes be able to attend recognition events of this nature.

Action: Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

Presidents Commission Grouping

The Presidents Commission has designated the following 71 proposals for placement at this point in the agenda. Please note that inclusion of a proposal in this grouping does not constitute a position by the Commission for or against the proposal; rather, the proposals are placed here because the Commission believes that they are of particular interest to chief executive officers. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Commission are identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. Please note also the Commission has designated all 71 proposals in this grouping for roll-call votes.

NO. 7 (NO. 2-1) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DELAY OF EFFECTIVE DATE

Intent: To delay the effective date of all legislation related to the revised NCAA membership structure until February 1, 1998.

[The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

A. Constitution: Amend 2.7, page 4, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

“2.7 THE PRINCIPLE OF DIVERSITY WITHIN GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

"The Association shall promote diversity of representation within its various divisional governance structures and substructures. Each divisional governing body must assure gender and ethnic diversity among the membership of the bodies in the division's administrative structure."

- B. Constitution:** Amend 3, pages 7-18, by deleting the current dominant voting requirements (*) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

- C. Constitution:** Amend 3.7, page 19, by deleting the current common voting requirement (#) and substituting a federated voting requirement (I/II/III).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- D. Constitution:** Amend 4.02.1, 4.02.2 and 4.02.4, page 22, and 4.8, page 38, by deleting the current dominant voting requirements (*) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

- E. Constitution:** Amend 4.02.3, page 22, by deleting the current common voting requirement (#) and substituting a federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- F. Constitution:** Amend 4.01.1, page 21, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"4.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

"4.01.1 Structure. The Association's administrative structure shall include an Executive Committee comprised of institutional chief executive officers (CEOs) that oversee Association-wide issues and shall ensure that each division operates consistent with the basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles of the Association (see Articles 1 and 2). In addition, the administrative structure of each division shall empower a body of institutional CEOs to set forth the policies, rules and regulations for operating the division. Further, the administrative structure of each division shall empower a body of athletics administrators and faculty athletics representatives (and in Division III, institutional CEOs) to make recommendations to the division's body of institutional CEOs and to handle responsibilities delegated to it."

[Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to Article 4 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

- G. Constitution:** Amend 5.01, page 43-44, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

"5.01.1 Basis of Legislation. All legislation of the Association that governs the conduct of the intercollegiate athletics pro-

grams of its member institutions shall be adopted by the membership in Convention assembled, or by the presidential administrative groups and the division management councils as set forth in Constitution 4, as determined by the constitution and bylaws governing each division, and shall be consistent with the purposes and fundamental policy set forth in Constitution 1, and shall be designed to advance one or more principles such as those set forth in Constitution 2."

[Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to Article 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

- H. Bylaws:** Amend 6 through 20, pages 73-438, and 22 through 32, pages 459-532, by deleting the current dominant voting requirements (*) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

- I. Bylaws:** Amend 6 through 20, pages 73-438, and 22 through 32, pages 459-532, by deleting the current common voting requirements (#) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- J. Bylaws:** Amend 6 through 20, pages 73-438, and 22 through 32, pages 459-532, by deleting the current general voting requirements (+) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[General provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

Source: All members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997 **February 1, 1998.**

Rationale: This proposal will delay the implementation of the revised membership structure until after the 1998 NCAA Convention. It will provide additional necessary time to "fine-tune" the details of the new governance structure and provide the membership one last opportunity to approve any changes to the structure.

Committee Position (Transition Oversight Committee): The committee opposes this proposal.

Action: Parts A, B, D, F, G and H were defeated, 105-667-13. Parts C, E and I were defeated (Division I: 33-268-5; Division II: 23-171-4; Division III: 69-176-7). Part J defeated (55-652-15).

NO. 8 (NO. 2-18) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS/ MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Intent: To establish minimal goals for gender representation and ethnic minority representation on the Division I Board of Directors and the Division I Management Council and to establish a

process for attaining those goals.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.2.1, pages 30-31, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2.1 Composition: Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, the Board of Directors shall include 15 members and shall be comprised of Division I chief executive officers (CEOs). **As a minimal goal, the Board membership shall include at least one representative who is an ethnic minority and at least one representative of each gender and a single member shall not be considered to meet both minimums.** The members of the Board shall include:"

[Remainder of 4.2.1 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.1 pages 34-35, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.1 Composition. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, the Division I Management Council shall include 34 members and shall be comprised of athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors senior women administrators, assistant athletics directors, conference administrators) and faculty athletics representatives. **As a minimal goal, the Management Council membership shall include representatives that comprise at least 20 percent ethnic minorities and at least 35 percent persons of each gender.** The members of the Council shall include:"

[Remainder of 4.5.1 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 30 by adding new 30.1, page 465, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"30.1 Division I Governance Structure

"30.1.1 Process for Selection of Division I Board of Directors and Management Council. In order to assure that on the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council at least the minimal goals for diversity of membership (as set forth in 4.2.1 and 4.5.1) are met, the following process shall be utilized:

"(a) The conferences represented in each subdivision of Division I (i.e., Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA among the conferences identified in 4.2.1) shall review together within each subdivision the open positions on the Board of Directors or Management Council in that subdivision and shall attempt to coordinate the conference selections to assure adequate diversity in the subdivision's representatives to that body.

"(b) The Board of Directors shall review the selections from each of the subdivisions to assess the diversity of those choices. If the Board does not

approve the diversity of the selections of the subdivision, it shall ask that subdivision to reconsider the choices with direction from the Board and to report any changes.

"(c) If after such reconsideration, the Board of Directors still does not agree that the selections of any subdivisions are adequately diverse, it shall direct each conference that has made a selection in that subdivision in that year to provide additional options in accordance with the following guidelines:

"(1) For Board positions, the conference shall be asked to provide a report on the diversity, qualifications and willingness to serve on the Board of the chief executive officers in the conference. The report shall be forwarded to a subcommittee of the Board consisting of four senior returning members of the Board, two from Division I-A and one each from Division I-AA and Division I-AAA. The subcommittee shall analyze the availability and alter selections as warranted to achieve adequate diversity.

"(2) For Management Council positions, the conference shall be asked to select a slate of four individuals qualified to serve on the Council, including at least one woman and one ethnic minority, and the Board shall make the selections for service on the Council.

"(d) The conferences' selections, including their diversity, shall be monitored over time to provide information about which conferences have been most attentive to diversity and which conferences' initial choices have been modified to address the need to achieve greater diversity. That information can be considered by the Board in reviewing future selection opportunities."

[30.1 through 30.17, renumbered as 30.2 through 30.18, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I transition Board of Directors).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: At the 1996 NCAA Convention, Division I members adopted a resolution calling for a plan to address diversity of representation in the division's new governance structure. The transition Board of Directors appointed a subcommittee to develop a plan. That subcommittee considered input from the conferences represented in the new structure, the transition Management Council, the Committee on Women's Athletics,

the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee and the Division I Steering Committee. The subcommittee's recommendations are the basis for this legislation, which sets minimal goals for ethnic and gender representation in the governance structure and establishes a process for achieving them. Through an opportunity for interconference discussion within each subdivision, the process permits maximum conference involvement in selecting its representative. The subcommittee recommendations also include an indication that the minimal goals established for the Management Council will serve as a guideline for diversity within the cabinets and committees that make up the substructure of the division.

Action: Adopted in Division I as amended by No. 8-1 (311-6-1).

NO. 8-1 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS/ MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Intent: To move from the Administrative Regulations to the Constitution the process for attaining the goals to establish minimal goals for gender representation and ethnic minority representation on the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council.

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 8-C, 30.1, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"30.1 DIVISION I GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE 4.2.3.1.

"30.1.1 Process for Selection of Division I Board of Directors and Management Council. In order to assure that on the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council at least the minimal goals for diversity of membership (as set forth in 4.2.1 and 4.5.1, respectively) are met, the following process shall be utilized:

"(a) The conferences represented in each subdivision of Division I (i.e., Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA, among the conferences identified in NCAA Constitution 4.2.1), shall review together within each subdivision the open positions on the Board or Management Council in that subdivision and shall attempt to coordinate the conference selections to assure adequate diversity in the subdivision's representatives to that body.

"(b) The Board of Directors shall review the selections from each of the subdivisions to assess the diversity of those choices. If the Board does not approve the diversity of the selections of a subdivision, it shall ask that subdivision to reconsider the choices with direction from the Board and to report any changes.

"(c) If after such reconsideration, the Board still does not agree that the selections of any subdivision are adequately diverse, it shall direct each conference that has made a selec-

tion in that subdivision in that year to provide additional options in accordance with the following guidelines:

"(1) For Board positions, the conference shall be asked to provide a report on the diversity, qualifications and willingness to serve on the Board of the chief executive officers in the conference. The report shall be forwarded to a subcommittee of the Board consisting of four senior returning members of the Board, two from Division I-A and one each from Division I-AA and Division I-AAA. the subcommittee shall analyze the availability and alter selections as warranted to achieve adequate diversity.

"(2) For Management Council positions, the conference shall be asked to select a slate of four individuals qualified to serve on the Council, including at least one woman and one ethnic minority, and the Board shall make the selections for service on the Council.

"(d) The conferences' selections, including their diversity, shall be tracked over time to provide information about which conferences have been most attentive to diversity and which conferences' initial choices have been modified to address the need to achieve greater diversity. That information can be considered by the Board in reviewing future selection opportunities."

[30.1 through 30.17, renumbered as 30.2 through 30.18, unchanged.]

B. Bylaw: Amend Proposal No. 8-C, 30.1, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"30.1 DIVISION I GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE 4.5.3.1.

"30.1.1 Process for Selection of Division I Board of Directors and Management Council. In order to assure that on the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council at least the minimal goals for diversity of membership (as set forth in 4.2.1 and 4.5.1, respectively) are met, the following process shall be utilized:

"(a) The conferences represented in each subdivision of Division I (i.e., Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA, among the conferences identified in NCAA Constitution 4.2.1), shall review together within each subdivision the open positions on the Board or Management Council in that subdivision and shall attempt to coordinate the conference selections to assure adequate diversity in the subdivision's representatives to that body.

"(b) The Board of Directors shall review the selections from each of the subdivisions to assess the diversity of those choices. If the Board does not approve the diversity of the selections of a subdivision, it shall ask that subdivision to reconsider the choices with direction from the Board and to report any changes.

"(c) If after such reconsideration, the Board still does not agree that the selections of any subdivision are adequately diverse, it shall direct each conference that has made a selec-

tion in that subdivision in that year to provide additional options in accordance with the following guidelines:

"(1) For Board positions, the conference shall be asked to provide a report on the diversity, qualifications and willingness to serve on the Board of the chief executive officers in the conference. The report shall be forwarded to a subcommittee of the Board consisting of four senior returning members of the Board, two from Division I-A and one each from Division I-AA and Division I-AAA. the subcommittee shall analyze the availability and alter selections as warranted to achieve adequate diversity.

"(2) For Management Council positions, the conference shall be asked to select a slate of four individuals qualified to serve on the Council, including at least one woman and one ethnic minority, and the Board shall make the selections for service on the Council.

"(d) The conferences' selections, including their diversity, shall be tracked over time to provide information about which conferences have been most attentive to diversity and which conferences' initial choices have been modified to address the need to achieve greater diversity. That information can be considered by the Board in reviewing future selection opportunities."

[30.1 through 30.17, renumbered as 30.2 through 30.18, unchanged.]

[Note: If adopted, this provision will be division-dominant legislation and may be amended only by at least a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting at a Division I annual or special Convention.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group and Southern Conference.

Rationale: The ability of a conference to appoint and hold responsible its representatives to the Board of Directors and Management Council is equal to the need for the Board of Directors and Management Council to be a diverse group. Moving this process into the constitution ensures that any alteration of this process is subject to two-thirds request by the Division I membership.

Action: Adopted (268-55-1).

NO. 9 (NO. 2-11) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS/ MANAGEMENT COUNCIL/CABINETS

Intent: To establish that the chairs of the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council shall serve two-year nonrenewable terms; that at least once every three term rotations, the chairs of the Board of Directors and the Management Council shall rotate among subdivisions; and that among the chairs of the Board of Directors, the Management Council and the Cabinets, there shall be at least one representative from each subdivision at any time.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.2.3 by adding new 4.2.3.3, page 31,

renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2.3.3 Chair. The Division I Board of Directors shall elect one of its members to serve for a two-year period as chair. The chair shall not be eligible for immediate reelection to that position.

"4.2.3.3.1 Division I-AA/I-AAA Representative as Chair of the Board of Directors or Management Council. At least once in every three term rotations of the chairs of the Board and the Council, there shall be a Division I-AA or I-AAA conference representative serving as chair of either the Board or the Council.

"4.2.3.3.2 Subdivision Representation Among Chairs. Among the chairs of the Division I Board of Directors, Management Council and Cabinets, there shall be at least one representative from each subdivision serving as chair at any time."

[4.2.3.3 and 4.2.3.4 renumbered as 4.2.3.4 and 4.2.3.5, unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.3 by adding new 4.5.3.3, pages 35-36, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.3.3 Chair. The Division I Management Council shall elect one of its members to serve for a two-year period as chair. The chair shall not be eligible for immediate reelection to that position.

"4.5.3.3.1 Division I-AA/I-AAA Representative as Chair of the Board of Directors or Management Council. At least once in every three term rotations of the chairs of the Board and the Council, there shall be a Division I-AA or I-AAA conference representative serving as chair of either the Board or the Council.

"4.5.3.3.2 Subdivision Representation Among Chairs. Among the chairs of the Division I Board of Directors, Management Council and Cabinets, there shall be at least one representative from each subdivision serving as chair at any time."

[4.5.3.3 and 4.5.3.4 renumbered as 4.5.3.4 and 4.5.3.5, unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend the newly created Bylaw 21.8 (Division I Committee Structure), as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"21.8.2.1.1 Subdivision Representation Among Chairs. Among the chairs of the Division I Board of Directors, Management Council and Cabinets, there shall be at least one representative from each subdivision serving as chair at any time."

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The Council reviewed a recommendation of the Division I transition Management Council that the chairs of the Board of Directors and Management Council should rotate among the three subdivisions of Division I. It noted that the Division I transition Board preferred an approach that allows the chairs to be selected by the bodies without subdivision restrictions. The Council decided to sponsor this proposal as a compromise. It is intended to assure that each subdivision has a representative serving as chair of the Board, the Management Council or one of the cabinets at all times. Further, it guarantees that Division I-AA or I-AAA conference representatives at least occasionally serve as chairs of the Board or Management Council.

Action: Adopted in Division I (321-7-0).

**NO. 10 (NO. 2-15) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— ROTATION OF CHAIRS OF
GOVERNING BODIES — DIVISION I**

Intent: To require the chairs of the Division I Board of Directors, Management Council and Cabinets to rotate between all subdivisions on an equitable, if not equal, basis.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.2.3 by adding new 4.2.3.5, page 31, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“4.2.3.5 Rotation of Board/Council Chairs. The chairs of the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council shall not be from the same Division I subdivision.”

B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.3 by adding new 4.5.3.5, page 36, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“4.5.3.5 Rotation of Board/Council Chairs. The chairs of the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council shall not be from the same Division I subdivision.”

C. Constitution: Amend 4.8 by adding new 4.8.1, page 38, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“4.8.1 Rotation of Cabinet Chairs. The chairs of the Division I Cabinets shall include at least one representative from each subdivision.”

Source: All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic and Southern Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Subdivision diversity within the NCAA Division I governance structure is important to ensure that different viewpoints are included in the representative governance structure. This proposal furthers such a principle.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and the transition Management Council oppose this proposal and, instead, support Proposal No. 9.

Action: Moot in Division I.

***NO. 11 (NO. 2-12) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS/
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

Intent: To establish that the chairs of the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council shall serve two-year, nonrenewable terms.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.2.3 by adding new 4.2.3.3, page 31, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“4.2.3.3 Chair. The Division I Board of Directors shall elect one of its members to serve for a two-year period as chair. The chair shall not be eligible for immediate re-election to that position.”

[4.2.3.3 and 4.2.3.4 renumbered as 4.2.3.4 and 4.2.3.5, unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.3 by adding new 4.5.3.3, pages 35-36, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“4.5.3.3 Chair. The Division I Management Council shall elect one of its members to serve for a two-year period as chair. The chair shall not be eligible for immediate re-election to that position.”

[4.5.3.3 and 4.5.3.4 renumbered as 4.5.3.4 and 4.5.3.5, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (Division I transition Board of Directors).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The Division I transition Board of Directors reviewed a variety of approaches to limiting eligibility for the chairs of the Board of Directors and Management Council. It was agreed that all members of each of the bodies should be eligible to serve as chair and that the chair should be elected from among the members. It was further agreed that the chair positions should not be limited or restricted by subdivision so that each body is free to select the individual it believes can best act as its chair.

Action: Moot in Division I.

**NO. 12 (NO. 2-10) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Intent: To establish an operating principle that a system for rotat-

ing I-AA and I-AAA representatives to the Division I Board of Directors be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

Constitution: Amend 4.2.1 by adding new 4.2.1.4, page 31, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2.1.4 Rotation of Representatives. The rotation of Division I Board of Directors conference representatives between the I-AA and I-AAA conferences, and within each of those subdivisions, shall be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences. The rotation and current conference representatives shall be reported annually by July 1 to the Board of Directors and published in the NCAA Manual and The NCAA News."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Big Sky, Mid-Continent and Southern Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In 1995, the I-AA and I-AAA members of the NCAA Presidents Commission delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences the responsibility of developing and initiating a system for rotating Board of Directors and Management Council seats between each of those subdivisions and within each subdivision. This legislation will formalize that process in the NCAA constitution as it relates to the Division I Board of Directors representatives from I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors): The Division I transition Board of Directors did not take a specific position on this proposal. It forwarded a suggested rotation schedule to the Division I-AA and Division I-AAA conferences for reaction.

Action: Adopted in Division I (307-5-4).

NO. 13 (NO. 2-13) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Intent: To establish that the term of office for I-AA and I-AAA members of the Division I Board of Directors be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences as specified.

Constitution: Amend 4.2.3.2, page 31, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2.3.2 Term of Office. The term of office for the members of the Board of Directors shall be as follows:

"(a) Division I-A members of the Board of Directors shall serve for a term of four years. Division I-A Board members are not eligible for immediate reelection.

"(b) The I-AA and I-AAA conferences shall be authorized to determine the term of office of the I-AA and I-AAA members, not to exceed four consecutive years in length. Further, after completing a four-year term of office, members of the Board may not serve again for two years. The term of office shall be annually reported to the Board of Directors and published in the NCAA Manual and The NCAA News."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Continent and Southern Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In 1995, the I-AA and I-AAA members of the NCAA Presidents Commission delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences the responsibility of developing and initiating a system for rotating Board and Management Council seats from those subdivisions on the new governance bodies. As part of this responsibility, the conferences developed a system for terms of office for the Board and Council. This legislation will formalize that process in the NCAA Constitution as it relates to the Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conference representatives on the Board of Directors.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors): The Division I transition Board of Directors did not take a specific position on this proposal. It forwarded a suggested rotation schedule to the Division I-AA and Division I-AAA conferences for reaction.

Action: Adopted in Division I (308-4-5).

NO. 14 (NO. 2-20) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Intent: To establish an operating principle that a system of rotation for I-AA and I-AAA representatives to the Division I Management Council be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

Constitution: Amend 4.5.1 by adding new 4.5.1.4, page 35, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.1.4 Rotation of Representatives. The rotation of Division I Management Council conference representatives between the I-AA and I-AAA conferences, and within each of those subdivisions, shall be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences. The rotation and current conference representatives shall be reported annually by July 1 to the Board of Directors and published in the NCAA Manual and The NCAA News."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic
Legislative Proposals

letic, Mid-Continent, Southern and Southland Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In 1995, the I-AA and I-AAA members of the NCAA Presidents Commission delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences the responsibility of developing and initiating the system for rotating Board and Management Council seats between each of those subdivisions and within each subdivision. This legislation will formalize that process in the NCAA Constitution as it relates to the Division I Management Council representatives from I-AA and I-AAA conferences.

Committee Position (Division I transition Management Council): The Division I transition Management Council did not take a specific position on this proposal. It forwarded a suggested rotation schedule to the Division I-AA and Division I-AAA conferences for reaction.

Action: Adopted in Division I (306-4-5).

**NO. 15 (NO. 2-22) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I MANAGEMENT
COUNCIL**

Intent: To establish that the term of office for I-AA and I-AAA members to the Division I Management Council be developed, maintained and revised by the I-AA and I-AAA conferences as specified.

Constitution: Amend 4.5.3.2, page 36, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.3.2 Term of Office. The term of office for the members of the Management Council shall be as follows:

"(a) Division I-A members of the Management Council shall serve for a term of four years. **Division I-A** Council members are not eligible for immediate reelection.

"(b) The I-AA and I-AAA conferences shall be authorized to determine the term of office of the I-AA and I-AAA members, not to exceed four consecutive years in length. Further, after completing a four-year term of office, members of the Council may not serve again for two years. The term of office shall be annually reported to the Board of Directors and published in the NCAA Manual and The NCAA News."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Continent, Southern and Southland Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In 1995, the I-AA and I-AAA members of the NCAA Presidents Commission delegated to the I-AA and I-AAA conferences the responsibility of developing and initiating a system for rotating Board and Council seats from those subdivisions on the

new governance bodies. As part of this responsibility, the conferences developed a system for term of offices for the Board and Council. This legislation will formalize that process in the NCAA Constitution as it relates to the Divisions I-AA and I-AAA representatives on the Division I Management Council.

Committee Position (Division I transition Management Council): The Division I transition Management Council did not take a specific position on this proposal. It forwarded a suggested rotation schedule to the Division I-AA and Division I-AAA conferences for reaction.

Action: Adopted in Division I (310-3-4).

**NO. 16 (NO. 2-14) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS/
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

Intent: To permit Division I conferences to remove their representatives to the NCAA Division I Board of Directors or Management Council during their term of office.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.2.3.2, page 31, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2.3.2 Term of Office. Members of the Board of Directors shall serve for a term of four years. Board members are not eligible for immediate reelection. A Division I conference may remove its representative during a term of office."

B. Constitution: Amend 4.5.3.2, page 36, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.3.2 Term of Office. Members of the Division I Management Council shall serve for a term of four years. Council members are not eligible for immediate reelection. A Division I conference may remove its representative during a term of office."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Big Sky, Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Continent and Southern Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Since Division I conferences will select their representatives to the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council in the new governance structure, they should be permitted to remove their respective representatives.

Action: Adopted in Division I (238-74-6).

**NO. 17 (NO. 2-9) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS/
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

Intent: To eliminate the distinction between Division I-AA representation and Division I-AAA representation on the NCAA Division

I Board of Directors and Management Council.

- A. Constitution:** Amend 4.2.1, pages 30-31, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2.1 Composition. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, the Board of Directors shall include 15 members and shall be comprised of Division I chief executive officers (CEOs). The members of the Board shall include:

[4.2.1-(a) and 4.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Six institutional CEOs from among the following conferences and at-large positions:

"(1) *Nine Division I-AA Conferences:*

Big Sky Conference;
Ivy Group;
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference;
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference;
Ohio Valley Conference;
Patriot League;
Southern Conference;
Southland Conference;
Southwestern Athletic Conference.

"(2) *Eleven Division I-AAA Conferences:*

Atlantic 10 Conference;
Big South Conference;
Colonial Athletic Association;
Mid-Continent Conference;
Midwestern Collegiate Conference;
Missouri Valley Conference;
North Atlantic Conference;
Northeast Conference;
Sun Belt Conference;
Trans America Athletic Conference; or
West Coast Conference.

"(3) (2) Two at-large positions from the Division I-AA and/or Division I-AAA membership used to fill the remaining positions on the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council."

- B. Constitution:** Amend 4.5.1, pages 34-35, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.1 Composition. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, the Division I Management Council shall include 34 members and shall be comprised of athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior women administrators, assistant athletics directors, conference administrators) and faculty athletics representatives. The members of the Council shall include:

[4.5.1-(a) and 4.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Sixteen administrators or representatives from among the following conferences and at-large positions:

"(1) *Nine Division I-AA Conferences:*

Big Sky Conference;
Ivy Group;
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference;
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference;
Ohio Valley Conference;
Patriot League;
Southern Conference;
Southland Conference;
Southwestern Athletic Conference.

"(2) *Eleven Division I-AAA Conferences:*

Atlantic 10 Conference;
Big South Conference;
Colonial Athletic Association;
Mid-Continent Conference;
Midwestern Collegiate Conference;
Missouri Valley Conference;
North Atlantic Conference;
Northeast Conference;
Sun Belt Conference;
Trans America Athletic Conference; or
West Coast Conference.

"(3) (2) Two at-large positions from the Division I-AA and/or Division I-AAA membership used to fill the remaining positions on the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council."

Source: Butler University, Drake University, University of Evansville, Illinois State University, Indiana State University, University of Northern Iowa, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Southwest Missouri State University, Valparaiso University and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The establishment of a representative governance structure within Division I to consider Division I-AA football issues makes it unnecessary to distinguish between I-AA and I-AAA representatives on the Board of Directors and Management Council. The Division I-AA/I-AAA representative balance on the Board of Directors and the Management Council will not be affected by this legislation.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division I (238-74-6).

Legislative Proposals

Legislative Proposals

**NO. 18 (NO. 2-17) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I MANAGEMENT
COUNCIL**

Intent: To expand the pool of potential Division I Management Council members as specified.

Constitution: Amend 4.5.1, page 34, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.1 Composition. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, the Division I Management Council shall include 34 members and shall be comprised of athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior women administrators, assistant athletics directors, conference administrators), and faculty athletics representatives and institutional administrators to whom athletics departments report or who have other significant duties regarding athletics. The members of the Council shall include:"

[Remainder of 4.5.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Ivy Group, and Mid-Continent, Mid-Eastern Athletic and Midwestern Collegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This legislation is necessary to create as large a pool as possible of potential Division I Management Council members, which will provide the highest quality of representation and increase opportunities to achieve diversity of representation.

Action: Adopted in Division I (203-122-4).

***NO. 19 (NO. 2-21) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I MANAGEMENT
COUNCIL**

Intent: To permit each conference represented on the Division I Management Council to select an alternate representative to serve in place of a regular member who is unable to attend successive meetings, and to require the approval of the chair of the Board of Directors to permit the alternate to attend meetings.

Constitution: Amend 4.5.3.1, pages 35-36, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.3.1 Selection. Members of the Division I Management Council shall be selected by the constituencies that they represent. Each membership unit (e.g., conference) that is authorized to select or nominate individuals to serve on the Council must have a plan to assure diversity among these individuals that the membership identifies. Each membership unit (e.g., conference) may select one alternate to serve on the Council in place of a regular member who is unable to attend successive meetings. The alternate may attend only upon the approval of the chair of the Board of Directors."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division I transition Board of Directors).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal provides an opportunity for each conference represented on the Management Council to continue to be represented in the governance structure when the conference's representative will be unavailable for a period of time. The transition Board of Directors believes it is important for the Management Council to retain a continuity of membership so that the representatives are able to work together to resolve issues. The Board was concerned that a process that allowed a conference to send an alternate to any meeting it wished would not only disrupt the continuity of the Council but could serve as a disincentive to members to attend regularly. At the same time, the Board recognized the need for conferences to have a representative voice at the table as much as possible. The Board decided to offer a compromise approach that allows for an alternate when a member will miss consecutive meetings and that requires the approval of the alternate by the chair of the Board.

Action: Moot in Division I.

**NO. 20 (NO. 2-19) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I MANAGEMENT
COUNCIL**

Intent: To provide that alternates may participate in Division I Management Council meetings.

Constitution: Amend 4.5.1 by adding new 4.5.1.4, page 35, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.1.4 Alternate Representation. A conference shall appoint a permanent alternate for each of its representatives on the Division I Management Council. Alternates may attend, participate fully in, and vote in any Management Council meeting or other activity that the regular member is unable to attend for a compelling reason."

Source: All members of the Ivy Group, and Mid-Eastern Athletic and Midwestern Collegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The size of the Management Council and the likely frequency of its meetings and other activities make it almost certain that not every member will be able to attend every meeting or other activity (e.g., conference call). In the new conference-based representative system, it is imperative that such absences not deprive conferences of the opportunity to be represented, especially in Divisions I-AA and I-AAA in which each conference has only one representative at any one time.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors): The Division I transition Board of Directors opposes this proposal and, instead, supports Proposal No. 19.

Action: Adopted in Division I (232-94-1).

***NO. 21 (NO. 2-24) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE**

Intent: To establish an Administrative Committee of the Division I Management Council as specified.

Constitution: Amend Bylaw 4.5 by adding new 4.5.5, page 36, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.5 Administrative Committee.

"4.5.5.1 Composition and Selection. The Administrative Committee of the Division I Management Council shall consist of four members of the Management Council, including two representatives of Division I-AA conferences, one representative of Division I-AA conferences and one representative of Division I-AAA conferences. The chair of the Management Council shall be one of the four members of the Administrative Committee and shall serve as its chair.

"4.5.5.2 Duties. The Administrative Committee is empowered to act on behalf of the Management Council to transact necessary and routine items of business clearly necessary to promote the normal and orderly administration of Division I in the interim between meetings of the Management Council.

"4.5.5.3 Approval. All actions of the Administrative Committee shall be effective immediately and shall be reported to and subject to approval of the full Division I Management Council."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The Division I transition Management Council believes that there will be sufficient activity within the division between regularly scheduled meetings of the Management Council to require action by the governance structure. It was agreed that the best way to handle interim actions would be through a small subcommittee of the Council that includes representation from each of the three subdivisions. The transition Board of Directors thought it was important to clarify that the Administrative Committee was being created only for the purpose of handling routine administrative functions that are necessary to the functioning of the division. It was agreed that all actions of the Administrative Committee must be approved at the following meeting of the entire Management Council.

Action: Adopted in Division I (323-6-0).

***NO. 22 (NO. 2-16) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION II PRESIDENTS COUNCIL**

Intent: To amend the legislation related to the composition of the Division II Presidents Council as specified.

Constitution: Amend 4.3, pages 32-33, as follows:
[Division II only, roll call]

[4.3 and 4.3.1 unchanged.]

[4.3.1.1 and 4.3.1.2 unchanged.]

"4.3.2 Duties and Responsibilities. The Division II Presidents Council shall:

[4.3.2-(a) through 4.3.2-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Elect a chair and vice-chair;

[4.3.2-(d) through 4.3.2-(f) relettered as 4.3.2-(e) through 4.3.2-(g), unchanged.]

"(h) Establish the final sequence of legislative proposals in the agenda for the Division II business session at the annual Convention, within the provisions of 5.1.4.3.1.

"(i) Call for a special Convention of Division II.

[4.3.2-(g) through 4.3.2-(i) relettered as 4.3.2-(j) through 4.3.2-(l), unchanged.]

"(j) (m) Assure that there is gender and ethnic diversity among its membership, the membership of the Division II Management Council (see 4.6) and the membership of each of the other bodies in the Division II governance structure;

[4.3.2-(k) through 4.3.2-(n) relettered as 4.3.2-(n) through 4.3.2-(q), unchanged.]

"(o) (r) Convene same-site meetings, as necessary, with the Division II Management Council; and

"(s) Appoint such committees or subcommittees as may be necessary for executing the provisions of this constitution or the Division II bylaws.

"4.3.2.1 Duties of the Chair. The chair of the Presidents Council shall:

"(a) Serve as a spokesperson for Division II;

"(b) Preside at Division II Presidents Council meetings;

"(c) Preside at the Division II business session at the annual Convention;

"(d) Serve as a member of the Association's Executive Committee;

"(e) Serve as chair of the Division II Administrative Committee; and

"(f) Serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Division II Budget/Finance Committee.

"4.3.2.2 Duties of the Vice-Chair. The vice-chair of the Presidents Council shall:

"(a) Take the chair's place and perform the chair's duties if the chair is absent or incapacitated;

"(b) Report to the Division II membership at each annual Convention on the financial affairs of the division;

"(c) Serve as a member of the Association's Executive Committee;

"(d) Serve as a member of the Division II Administrative Committee;

"(e) Serve as chair of the Division II Budget/Finance Committee.

"4.3.3 Election/Term of Office

[4.3.3.1 unchanged.]

"4.3.3.2 Term of Office. Members of the Division II Presidents Council shall serve four-year terms. Presidents Council members are not eligible for immediate reelection. **A Presidents Council member may be elected to an additional term on the Presidents Council after three years have elapsed. An individual who has served two terms on the Presidents Council may not serve further on the Presidents Council.**

"4.3.3.2.1 Chair and Vice-Chair. The chair and the vice-chair of the Council shall **each serve one terms not to exceed two years terms. The chair and vice-chair shall not be eligible for immediate reelection to that position.** In addition, a member must serve a minimum of one year on the Presidents Council prior to serving as chair or vice-chair.

"4.3.3.3 Staggered Terms.

"4.3.3.3.1 Chair and Vice-Chair. **The terms of service of the chair and vice-chair of the Division II Presidents Council shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity.**

"4.3.3.3.2 Members. The terms of service of Division II Presidents Council members shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms in order to accomplish this purpose.

"4.3.3.4 Determination of Full Term. Division II Presidents Council members who serve more than one-half of a **four-year term shall be considered to have served a full term and, thus, are not eligible for immediate reelection.**

"4.3.4 Operating Rules.

"4.3.4.1 Quorum. For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Presidents Council. For the Presidents Council to take action, a simple majority of Presidents Council members present and voting shall be required unless otherwise specified.

"4.3.4.2 Project Teams. The Presidents Council may establish project teams for a specified period of time to study and recommend courses of action on specific issues, and shall provide for a project team's appointment or election, tenure and duties, including the selection of the project team's chair."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal represents "fine tuning" of the legislation adopted at the 1996 Convention as part of the package of legislation related to membership restructuring, which established a Division II Presidents Council. The Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission and the Division II Steering Committee, as well as the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams, believe that the changes set forth in this proposal are necessary to further define the composition and duties of the Division II Presidents Council before it begins operating in August 1997.

Action: Adopted in Division II (233-0-3).

***NO. 23 (NO. 2-27) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION II ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE**

Intent: To establish a Division II Administrative Committee as specified.

Constitution: Amend Article 4 by adding new 4.8, page 38, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"4.8 DIVISION II ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

"4.8.1 Composition. **The Division II Administrative Committee shall consist of five members, including the chairs and vice-chairs of the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council. The fifth member shall be another member of the Presidents Council.**

"4.8.1.1 Chair. **The chair of the Division II Presidents Council shall serve as chair of the Administrative Committee.**

"4.8.2 Duties. **The Administrative Committee shall transact items of business clearly necessary to promote the**

normal and orderly administration of Division II in the interim between meetings of the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council. The Presidents Council representatives on the Administrative Committee shall have the authority to act alone to transact items of business that clearly fall within the sole jurisdiction of the Presidents Council. The Administrative Committee may authorize the chief of staff for Division II to act for it in approving routine waiver requests and sports committee recommendations, unless there is a question of interpretation or application, and these actions shall be subject to the approval of the Management Council and Presidents Council at their next regularly scheduled meetings.

"4.8.3 Approval. All actions of the Administrative Committee shall be effective immediately and shall be reported to and subject to approval by the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council at their next regularly scheduled meetings."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Once the new governance structure begins operating in August 1997, it will be necessary to have a group that has the authority to resolve issues between meetings of the Division II Presidents Council and the Division II Management Council. This proposal establishes such a group, which is comprised of representatives of both the Presidents Council and Management Council. It should be noted that actions of the Division II Administrative Committee will be reviewed by the full Presidents Council and Management Council during their respective meetings.

Action: Adopted in Division II (233-0-3).

***NO. 24 (NO. 2-29) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION II BUDGET AND FINANCE
COMMITTEE**

Intent: To establish a Division II Budget and Finance Committee as specified.

Constitution: Amend Article 4 by adding new 4.8, page 38, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"4.8 DIVISION II BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

"4.8.1 Composition. The Division II Budget and Finance Committee shall consist of seven members, including the vice-chair of the Presidents Council, the vice-chair of the Management Council, three additional members of the Presidents Council and two additional members of the

Management Council. The chairs of the Presidents Council and the Management Council shall serve as ex officio, nonvoting members.

"4.8.1.1 Chair. The vice-chair of the Division II Presidents Council shall serve as chair of the Division II Budget and Finance Committee.

"4.8.2 Duties. The Division II Budget and Finance Committee shall review budgetary recommendations related to the annual Division II budget and shall advise both the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council regarding the division's financial affairs."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Under the restructured Association that is scheduled to begin operating August 1, 1997, Division II will be guaranteed at least 4.37 percent of the Association's annual general operating revenue. The establishment of a Division II Budget and Finance Committee is necessary in order to have a group that will review and make recommendations related to the Division II budget and the division's fiscal and budgetary policies. In addition, the majority representation by chief executive officers on this committee will ensure chief executive officer involvement in all facets of the budgetary process.

Action: Adopted in Division II (233-1-3).

***NO. 25 (NO. 2-25) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION II MANAGEMENT
COUNCIL**

Intent: To amend the legislation related to the composition of the Division II Management Council as specified.

Constitution: Amend 4.6, pages 36-37, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

[4.6 and 4.6.1 unchanged.]

[4.6.1.1 unchanged.]

"4.6.1.2 Independent Institutions. The position reserved for a representative of independent institutions may not be filled by an individual from the same independent institution in successive terms.

"4.6.2 Duties and Responsibilities. The Division II Management Council shall:

[4.6.2-(a) through 4.6.2-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) Review and act upon the recommendations of the *substructure* of Division II committee structure and the recommendations of Division II representatives to committees with Association-wide functions; and

- “(g) Appoint the members of the *substructure* **Division II committee structure and appoint the Division II representatives to committees with Association-wide functions;**
 - “(h) **Elect a chair and vice-chair;**
 - “(i) **Organize and participate in an annual ‘summit’ with the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee;**
 - “(j) **Hear and act upon appeals of the findings of major violations by the Division II Committee on Infractions involving Division II institutions, subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council;**
 - “(k) **Review appeals by member institutions of decisions made by a Division II committee (excluding actions of the Eligibility Committee and the Committee on Infractions) or the NCAA staff regarding the application of NCAA legislation to a particular situation, subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council; and**
 - “(l) **Recommend the appointment of such committees or subcommittees as may be necessary for executing the provisions of this constitution or the Division II by-laws, subject to ratification by the Presidents Council.**
- “4.6.2.1 Duties of the Chair. The chair of the Management Council shall:**
- “(a) **Preside at Management Council meetings;**
 - “(b) **Serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Executive Committee;**
 - “(c) **Serve as a member of the Division II Administrative Committee;**
 - “(d) **Report to the Division II membership at the annual Convention the activities of the Management Council and Division II committees; and**
 - “(e) **Serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of any Division II committee that reports to the Division II Management Council.**
 - “(f) **Serve as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the Division II Budget and Finance Committee.**
- “4.6.2.2 Duties of the Vice-Chair. The vice-chair of the Management Council shall:**
- “(a) **Take the chair’s place and perform the chair’s duties if the chair is absent or incapacitated;**
 - “(b) **Serve as a member of the Division II Administrative Committee;**
 - “(c) **Serve as a member of the Division II Budget/Finance Committee; and**
 - “(d) **Serve as chair of the Division II Championships Committee.**

“4.6.3 Election/Term of Office

[4.6.3.1 unchanged.]

“4.6.3.1.1 Chief Executive Officer Signature. Each conference must designate a chief executive officer from a member institution within the conference who shall sign the conference’s nomination form before the form is submitted.

[4.6.3.1.1 renumbered as 4.6.3.1.2, unchanged.]

“4.6.3.2 Term of Office. Members of the Division II Management Council shall serve four-year terms. Management Council members are not eligible for immediate reelection. A Management Council member may be elected to an additional term on the Management Council after three years have elapsed. An individual who has served two terms on the Management Council may not serve further on the Management Council.

“4.6.3.2.1 Chair and Vice-Chair. The chair and the vice-chair of the Council shall each serve *one* terms not to exceed two years terms. The chair and vice-chair shall not be eligible for immediate reelection to that position. In addition, a member must serve a minimum of one year on the Council prior to serving as chair or vice-chair.

“4.6.3.3 Staggered Terms.

“4.6.3.3.1 Chair and Vice-Chair. The terms of service of the chair and vice-chair of the Management Council shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity.

“4.6.3.3.2 Members. The terms of service of Division II Management Council members shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms in order to accomplish this purpose.

“4.6.3.4 Determination of Full Term. Division II Management Council members who serve more than one-half of a four-year term shall be considered to have served a full term and, thus, are not eligible for immediate reelection.

“4.6.4 Operating Rules

“4.6.4.1 Quorum. For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Management Council. For the Management Council to take action, a simple majority of Management Council members present and voting shall be required unless otherwise specified.

“4.6.4.2 Project Teams. The Management Council may establish project teams for a specified period of time to study and recommend courses of action on specific

issues, and shall provide for a project team's appointment or election, tenure and duties, including the selection of the project team's chair."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal represents "fine tuning" of the legislation adopted at the 1996 Convention as a part of the package of legislation related to membership restructuring, which established a Division II Management Council. The Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission and the Division II Steering Committee, as well as the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams, believe that the changes set forth in this proposal are necessary to further define the composition and duties of the Division II Management Council before it begins operating in August 1997.

Action: Adopted in Division II (233-1-3).

***NO. 26 (NO. 2-28) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION III ADMINISTRATIVE
COMMITTEE**

Intent: To establish a Division III Administrative Committee as specified.

Constitution: Amend Article 4 by adding new 4.8, page 38, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"4.8 DIVISION III ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

"4.8.1 Composition. The Division III Administrative Committee shall consist of five members, including the chair of the Division III Presidents Council, the vice-chair of the Presidents Council and the chair of the Division III Management Council. If the chair of the Management Council is a chief executive officer, the committee also shall include two athletics administrators who are senior members of the Management Council. If the chair of the Management Council is not a chief executive officer, the committee also shall include a chief executive officer serving on the Management Council and a senior member of the Management Council.

"4.8.2 Duties. The committee shall be empowered in the interim between meetings of the Presidents Council and Management Council to transact items of business clearly necessary to promote the normal and orderly administration of Division III.

"4.8.3 Ratification. All actions of the Administrative Committee shall be reported to and subject to ratification by

the Management Council and Presidents Council at their next regularly scheduled meetings."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division III Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The Division III Administrative Committee will be empowered to resolve administrative issues that arise during the interim between meetings of the Presidents Council and Management Council. Meetings of the Administrative Committee will occur as necessary, and will deal only with routine administrative topics, unless exigent circumstances exist. A majority of Administrative Committee members will be chief executive officers, consistent with the principle of greater presidential control in the restructured NCAA.

Action: Adopted in Division III (300-0-0).

***NO. 27 (NO. 2-26) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION III MANAGEMENT
COUNCIL**

Intent: To revise the composition of the Division III Management Council as specified; to establish a provision related to Management Council vacancies; to permit the Management Council to perform the duties currently exercised by the Administrative Review Panel related to the review of appeals, and to specify that the Management Council shall administer duties related to the Division III business session of the annual Convention.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.7.1, page 37, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"4.7.1 Composition. The Division III Management Council shall include 16 19 members and shall be comprised of Division III chief executive officers (CEOs), faculty athletics representatives, directors of athletics, senior women administrators and, conference representatives and student-athletes.

"4.7.1.1 Members Who Are Not Student-Athletes. At least two members who are not student-athletes shall be included from each Division III geographical region (see 4.9.2.2). One of these members shall serve as chair, and one shall serve as vice-chair. These members of the Council also shall include:

[4.7.1.1-(a) and 4.7.1.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) At least one two faculty athletics representatives;

[4.7.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) At least five eight men; and

"(f) At least five eight women."

"4.7.1.2 Student-Athletes. Two members of the Management Council shall be members of the Student-

Athlete Advisory Committee per 21.10.6.8.3.

"4.7.2 Vacancies. A representative of a playing conference or member institution whose term of service has expired shall not be replaced on the Management Council by a representative of the same conference or institution."

B. Constitution: Amend 4.7.2, page 37, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"4.7.2 Duties and Responsibilities. The Division III Management Council shall:

[4.7.2-(a) through 4.7.2-(g) unchanged.]

"(h) Review appeals by member institutions of decisions made by a Division III committee (excluding actions of the Committee on Eligibility and Infractions) or the NCAA staff regarding the application of NCAA legislation to a particular situation. The Management Council shall review the complete record in order to determine whether there is sufficient basis to grant relief from the application of the legislation. All waiver decisions shall be reported to the Division III Presidents Council for ratification.

"(i) Administer duties related to the Division III business session of the annual Convention, including arrangements, programs, rules, voting and the examination and approval of the voting credentials of Division III delegates."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division III Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal will add a second faculty athletics representative and two student-athletes to the Division III Management Council, to better represent those significant constituencies in the governance of Division III. It also will ensure that a greater number of conferences and independent institutions have an opportunity to fill vacancies on the Management Council. Finally, it will ensure that the Management Council has the authority to exercise the Convention management and waiver authority currently assigned to the Executive Committee and Administrative Review Panel, respectively.

Action: Adopted in Division III (241-1-0).

***NO. 28 (NO. 2-34) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— NCAA COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

Intent: To revise the NCAA committee structure by preserving certain Association-wide committees, creating common committees that affect more than one division and establishing federated committee structures, as specified.

A. Constitution: Amend 5.02.1 by adding new 5.02.1.2, page 44, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.02.1.2 Common. A common provision is a regulation that applies to more than one of the divisions of the Association. A common provision shall be adopted by each of the applicable divisions, acting separately pursuant to the divisional legislative process described in 5.3, and must be approved by all applicable divisions to be effective. Common provisions are identified by the pound sign (#)."

[5.02.1.2 renumbered as 5.02.1.3, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 21 by deleting 21.02.1 through 21.02.6, pages 439-441.

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

C. Bylaws: Amend 21 by adding new 21.02.1 through 21.02.3, page 439, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"21.02.1 Association-Wide Committees. Association-wide committees deal with issues that affect all members of the Association and perform duties necessary to the on-going operation of the Association. Association-wide committees are comprised of members from each of the Association's divisions.

"21.02.2 Common Committees. Common committees deal with issues that apply to more than one division of the Association. Common committees perform duties necessary to the on-going operation of the applicable divisions and are comprised of members from the applicable divisions.

"21.02.3 Federated Committees. Federated committees deal with issues that apply to a specific membership division. Federated committees perform duties necessary to the on-going operation of that division and are comprised only of members from that division."

D. Bylaws: Amend 21 by deleting 21.1 and 21.2, pages 441-444, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

E. Bylaws: Amend 21.3, pages 444-452, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

[Note: Portions of this proposal are presented in a nontraditional format.]

"21.3 GENERAL ASSOCIATION-WIDE COMMITTEES — GENERAL COMMITTEES

"21.3.1 Method of Selection and Operation. The Council Each division's governance structure shall appoint members to

serve on the general **Association-wide** committees of the Association, **consistent with that division's committee-appointment procedures** (see 21.8, 21.9 and 21.10) including the chair of each committee, except the Divisions I, II and III Championships Committee and their chairs shall be appointed by the Executive Committee. Each Council-appointed committee, except the Committee on Infractions, the Infractions Appeals Committee and the National Youth Sports Program Committee shall include at least one member of the Council, who shall serve as an ex officio committee member and shall be ineligible to serve as chair, except as specified herein. Unless otherwise specified, the actions of the general committees are subject to approval of the Council. **The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's membership divisions. The Executive Committee shall ratify the appointment of all individuals serving on Association-wide committees and shall appoint the chairs of those committees. The Executive Committee also shall ratify policies regarding length, location and expenses of Association-wide committee meetings.**

"21.3.2 Academic Requirements Committee.

[Remainder of 21.3.2 deleted.]

"21.3.3 Administrative Review Panel

[Remainder of 21.3.3 deleted.]

"21.3.4 Athletics Certification, Committee on

[Remainder of 21.3.4 deleted.]

"21.3.5 Basketball Officiating Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.5 deleted.]

"21.3.6 Championships Committee, Division I

[Remainder of 21.3.6 deleted.]

"21.3.7 Championships Committee, Division II

[Remainder of 21.3.7 deleted.]

"21.3.8 Championships Committee, Division III

[Remainder of 21.3.8 deleted.]

"21.3.9 Communications Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.9 deleted.]

"21.3.10 **21.3.2** Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, Committee on

[Remainder of 21.3.10 renumbered as 21.3.2, unchanged.]

"21.3.11 Eligibility Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.11 deleted.]

"21.3.12 Executive Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.12 deleted.]

"21.3.13 Financial Aid and Amateurism, Committee on

[Remainder of 21.3.13 deleted.]

"21.3.14 **21.3.3** Honors Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.14 renumbered as 21.3.3, unchanged.]

"21.3.15 Infractions, Committee on

[Remainder of 21.3.15 deleted.]

"21.3.16 Infractions Appeals Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.16 deleted.]

"21.3.17 Interpretations Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.17 deleted.]

"21.3.18 Legislative Review Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.18 deleted.]

"21.3.4 Memorial Resolutions Committee

"21.3.4.1 Composition. The Memorial Resolutions Committee shall consist of three members, one from each membership division.

"21.3.4.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for compiling the names of those individuals associated with intercollegiate athletics who died during the year immediately preceding the annual Convention. The committee shall make its report each year, memorializing the individuals involved, during the business sessions of the annual Convention.

"21.3.19 **21.3.5** Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.19 renumbered as 21.3.5, unchanged.]

"21.3.20 **21.3.6** National Youth Sports Program Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.20 renumbered as 21.3.6, unchanged.]

"21.3.21 **21.3.7** Olympic Sports Liaison Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.21 renumbered as 21.3.7, unchanged.]

"21.3.22 **21.3.8** Postgraduate Scholarship Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.22 renumbered as 21.3.8, unchanged.]

"21.3.23 Professional Sports Liaison Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.23 deleted.]

"21.3.24 Recruiting Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.24 deleted.]

"21.3.25 **21.3.9** Research Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.25 renumbered as 21.3.9, unchanged.]

"21.3.26 Review and Planning, Committee on

[Remainder of 21.3.26 deleted.]

"21.3.27 Special Events Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.27 deleted.]

"21.3.10 Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct, Committee on

"21.3.10.1 Composition. The Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct shall consist of eight members.

"21.3.10.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for promoting sportsmanship and ethical conduct

within the Association.

"21.3.28 Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.28 deleted.]

"21.3.29 Two-Year College Relations Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.29 unchanged.]

[21.3.30 **21.3.11** Walter Byers Scholarship Committee

[Remainder of 21.3.30 renumbered as 21.3.11, unchanged.]

"21.3.31 **21.3.12** Women's Athletics, Committee on"

[Remainder of 21.3.31 renumbered as 21.3.12, unchanged.]

- F. Bylaws:** Amend 21.3, pages 444-452, by deleting the current common voting requirement (#) and substituting a dominant voting requirement (*).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- G. Bylaws:** Amend 21.4, pages 452-453, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"21.4 **ASSOCIATION-WIDE COMMITTEES — RULES COMMITTEES WITHOUT CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES**

"21.4.1 Selection, Composition and Duties

"See 21.1 for membership requirements, duties and operating procedures applicable to all committees.)

"21.4.1.1 Method of Selection. **Each division's governance structure shall appoint members, to serve on the secretary-rules editor and the chair of each rules committees without championships administration responsibilities shall be nominated by the Men's or Women's Committee on Committees or by the membership and shall be elected at the annual Convention, subject to the ratification of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also shall appoint the chair and secretary-rules editor of each committee. The secretary-rules editor may be reelected without restriction and shall be a nonvoting member of the committee. The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's membership divisions.**

[21.4.1.2 unchanged.]

"21.4.1.3 Duties. Subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee, each rules committee shall establish and maintain rules of play in its sport consistent with the sound traditions of the sport and of such character as to ensure good sportsmanship and safe participation by the competitors. These playing rules shall be common for all divisions of the Association, and differences among the divisions shall not be permitted, except for the division-specific playing regulations developed to address significant financial impact and approved by the divisions championships committee and the Executive Committee pursuant to 21.3.6.2-(c), 21.3.7.2-(c) and 21.3.8.2-

(c).

"21.4.1.4 Cooperation With Other Organizations. *The Council may authorize a A rules committee to may cooperate with other national organizations in the development of common playing rules.*

"**21.4.1.5 Operation. The Executive Committee shall ratify policies regarding the length, location and expenses of association-wide committee meetings.**"

[Remainder of 21.4 unchanged.]

- H. Bylaws:** Amend 21.4, pages 452-453, by deleting the current common voting requirement (#) and substituting a dominant voting requirement (*).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- I. Bylaws:** Amend 21.5, pages 453-455, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.5 **COMMON COMMITTEES — SPORTS COMMITTEES WITH PLAYING RULES AND CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES**

"21.5.1 Selection, Composition and Duties

"(See 21.1 for membership requirements, duties and operating procedures applicable to all committees.)

"21.5.1.1 Method of Selection. **Each division's governance structure shall appoint members to serve on, the secretary-rules editor and the chair of each committees with playing rules and championships administration responsibilities shall be nominated by the Men's or Women's Committee on Committees or by the membership and shall be elected at the annual Convention, subject to the ratification of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also shall appoint the chair and secretary-rules editor of each committee. The secretary-rules editor may be reelected without restriction and shall be a nonvoting member of the committee. The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's membership divisions.**

[21.5.1.2 deleted. 21.5.1.3 and 21.5.1.4 renumbered as 21.5.1.2 and 21.5.1.3, unchanged.]

"21.5.1.5 **4** Duties

[21.5.1.5.1 and 21.5.1.5.1.1 deleted.]

"21.5.1.5.2 **21.5.1.4.1** Rules of Play. Subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee, each rules committee shall establish and maintain rules of play in its sport consistent with the sound traditions of the sport and of such character as to ensure good sportsmanship and safe participation by the competitors. These playing rules shall be common for all divisions of the Association, and differences among the divisions shall not be

permitted, except for the division-specific playing regulations developed to address significant financial impact and approved by the divisions championships committees and the Executive Committee pursuant to 21.3.6.2-(c), 21.3.7.2-(e) and 21.3.8.2-(c).

[21.5.1.5.3 renumbered as 21.5.1.4.2, unchanged.]

"21.5.1.5.4 **21.5.1.4.3** Cooperation With Other Organizations. The Council may authorize aA rules committee to may cooperate with other national organizations in the development of common playing rules.

"**21.5.1.4.4 Operation. The Executive Committee shall ratify policies regarding the length, location and expenses of common committee meetings.**"

[Remainder of 21.5 unchanged.]

- J. Bylaws:** Amend 21.5, pages 452-455, by deleting the current common voting requirements (#) and substituting the new common voting requirements (#).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- K. Bylaws:** Amend 21.6, pages 455-458, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"**21.6 COMMON COMMITTEES — SPORTS COMMITTEES WITH ONLY CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES**

"21.6.1 Selection, Composition and Duties

"(See 21.1 for membership requirements, duties and operating procedures applicable to all committees.)

"21.6.1.1 Method of Selection. **Each applicable division's governance structure shall nominate and select the** members and chair of each committee shall be nominated by the Men's or Women's Committee on Committees or by the membership and shall be elected at the annual Convention, **subject to the ratification of the Executive Committee.**

[21.6.1.2 deleted.]

"21.6.1.3 **21.6.1.2** Duties. Each committee shall be responsible for developing policies and procedures governing the administration and conduct of the NCAA championships under its jurisdiction, subject to the approval of **the applicable division's Championships Committee and Management Council the Executive Committee** and the requirements, standards and conditions prescribed by Bylaw 31. **Policies and procedures governing the administration of National Collegiate Championships applicable to more than one division also shall be subject to the ratification of the Executive Committee.** (Also see Bylaw 31 for committee duties related to the administration of championships.)

"21.6.1.4 **21.6.1.3** Special Operating Rules. Each committee shall act as one body to determine general policies for the

administration of championships. *Division subcommittees, composed of committee members from the respective divisions, shall be responsible for administering the respective division championships.*

[21.6.1.5 renumbered as 21.6.1.4, unchanged.]

"21.6.1.6 **21.6.1.5** Regional Advisory Committee. Regional advisory committees may be appointed by each championships committee as prescribed by the Executive Committee.

"**21.6.1.6 Operation. The Executive Committee shall ratify policies regarding the length, location and expenses of common committee meetings.**

[21.6.2 through 21.6.16 deleted.]

"21.6.17 **21.6.2** Golf Committee, Men's and **Divisions II and III** Women's. The Men's and **Divisions II and III** Women's Golf Committee shall consist of **20 5** members, including *nine members from Division I, five members from Division II five members from Division III and one member elected at large. Twelve members shall represent men's golf interest, including six from Division I and three each from Divisions II and III. Eight members shall represent women's golf interests, including three from Division I, two each from Divisions II and III, and one elected at large.* **The Divisions II and III members of the committee shall report, respectively, to the Divisions II and III Championships Committees and the Divisions II and III Management Councils regarding the administration of the Divisions II and III Women's Golf Championship.**

[21.6.17.1 and 21.6.18 through 21.6.32 deleted.]

- L. Bylaws:** Amend 21.6, pages 455-458, by deleting the current common voting requirements (#) and substituting the new common voting requirements (#).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- M. Bylaws:** Amend 21 by adding new 21.7, page 458, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

[Note: If adopted, this provision may be amended only by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting in Divisions I and II, acting separately through each division's legislative process per 5.3.]

"**21.7 COMMON COMMITTEES — COMMITTEES WITH GOVERNANCE ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES**

"21.7.1 Selection. Each applicable division's governance structure shall appoint members to serve on the common committees with governance administration responsibilities, subject to the ratification of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also shall appoint the chair. The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's applicable membership divisions.

"21.7.2 Operation. The Executive Committee shall ratify policies regarding the length, location and expenses of

common committee meetings.

"21.7.3 NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse Committee.

"21.7.3.1 Composition. The committee shall consist of nine members, including six members from Division I and three members from Division II.

"21.7.3.2 Duties. The committee shall oversee the operation of the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse."

N. Bylaws: Amend 21 by adding new 21.8, page 458, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"21.8 DIVISION I CABINETS AND COMMITTEES

"21.8.1 Eligibility for Membership.

"21.8.1.1 'On the Staff.' Individuals serving on Division I cabinets or committees, or as Division I representatives on Association-wide or common committees shall be salaried on a regular basis by a Division I institution or conference and perform a regular staff function representing at least 50 percent of the normal workload for a staff member at that institution or conference, unless otherwise specified.

"21.8.1.1.1 Modification in Employment Status. If a cabinet or committee member's employment status is altered to the extent that the individual no longer meets this requirement, the individual shall be replaced at the Division I Management Council meeting or at the cabinet meeting, whichever is appropriate, immediately following the change in status.

"21.8.1.1.2 Individuals on Sabbatical or Temporary Leave. An individual on sabbatical or other temporary leave for a period not exceeding 12 consecutive months may be considered to be 'on the staff' and eligible for cabinet or committee membership. An individual on terminal leave or on leave in excess of 12 consecutive months shall not be eligible to serve on a cabinet or committee.

"21.8.1.1.3 Waiver of Replacement Requirement. The Management Council, subject to ratification by the Board of Directors, shall have the authority to waive this provision or to approve a later replacement date if it deems that application of 21.8.1.1.1 would be detrimental to the work of the cabinet or committee involved.

"21.8.2 Method of Selection and Term of Office.

"21.8.2.1 Method of Selection. The Management Council shall appoint the cabinets and, unless otherwise specified, the committees of Division I, including the chair of each cabinet or committee. When specified,

committees that are subordinate to a cabinet (and their chairs) shall be appointed by that cabinet. Unless otherwise specified, the actions of the cabinets and committees are subject to approval of the Management Council.

"21.8.2.2 Four-Year Term. Unless otherwise specified, the Division I members of cabinets or committees shall be appointed for one four-year term. Unless otherwise specified, a member's term of service shall commence on the first day of September following the member's appointment. Unless otherwise specified, a former cabinet or committee member may be appointed to an additional term on that cabinet or committee after three years have elapsed. An individual who has served two terms on a cabinet or committee may not serve further on that cabinet or committee.

"21.8.2.2.1 Exception. This appointment provision shall not apply to the members of committees whose terms of office are specified under their respective sections of this bylaw. Such committees are the Committee on Infractions, Infractions Appeals Committee and Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

"21.8.2.3 Appointment to Fill Vacancies. Whenever a vacancy occurs among the members of a Division I cabinet or committee or among the Division I members of Association-wide or common committees, the Management Council, unless otherwise specified, shall fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term by a majority vote of its members present and voting.

"21.8.2.3.1 Unexpired Portion of Term. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term. Members who serve more than one-half of a term in such instances shall be considered to have served a full term.

"21.8.2.4 Adjustments to Achieve Staggered Terms. Members may be appointed for less than full terms whenever it is necessary to adjust the membership of a cabinet or committee to ensure that vacancies occur in proper sequence. Members who serve more than one-half of a term in such instances shall be considered to have served a full term.

"21.8.3 Removal From Cabinet or Committee. The chair of each cabinet or committee is authorized to recommend to the Management Council that a member be replaced if such member is not discharging the member's duties properly. In addition, a member who is absent from two consecutive meetings without reasons approved by the

appointing authority (i.e., Management Council or Cabinet) shall be removed from the cabinet or committee.

"21.8.4 Conflict of Interest. A cabinet or committee member shall not participate in the cabinet or committee's discussion or vote on any action that might bring direct or indirect financial benefit to the member or any organization in which the member is financially interested (other than the member's institution or the conference of which it is a member). A violation of this rule by a member of a cabinet or committee shall not invalidate the action taken by the cabinet or committee if, following disclosure of the conflict of interest, the cabinet or committee authorizes, ratifies or approves the action by a vote sufficient for the purpose, without counting the vote of the cabinet or committee member with the conflict of interest, and the Management Council approves such action.

"21.8.5 Meeting Length and Sites. The Management Council, subject to ratification by the Board of Directors, is responsible for developing policies governing the length, sites and expenses related to Division I cabinet and committee meetings (see 31.7.2). Such policies shall be published annually in the NCAA Committee Handbook.

"21.8.6 Cabinets.

"21.8.6.1 General Requirements. Each of the Division I-A conferences listed in 4.2.1-(a) shall have at least one representative on each of the cabinets. The conferences listed in 4.2.1-(b) combined shall have at least one representative on each of the cabinets. Each of the conferences listed in 4.2.1-(c)-(1) and (2) shall have at least two representatives on the cabinets in the aggregate.

"21.8.6.2 Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet.

"21.8.6.2.1 Composition. The Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet shall consist of 34 members, including 18 representing Division I-A (eight positions shall be allocated for faculty athletics representatives, four allocated for directors of athletics, three allocated for senior woman administrators and three unallocated) and eight each representing Divisions I-AA and I-AAA (two positions in each subdivision shall be allocated for faculty athletics representatives, three allocated for directors of athletics, two allocated for senior woman administrators and one unallocated). Those eligible for the unallocated positions are athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior woman administrators, assistant directors of athletics, conference administrators) and faculty athletics representatives.

"21.8.6.2.2 Duties. The cabinet (or a subcommittee designated by it) shall:

- "(a) Be responsible for review and consideration of those portions of the Division I legislation that relate to principles of sound academic requirements;
- "(b) Work with the Association-wide Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse Committee concerning issues related to the certification of initial eligibility for athletics competition in Division I and work with the Division II governance structure to assure to the greatest extent possible that consistent information is available to prospective student-athletes;
- "(c) Be responsible for the compilation and disclosure of information concerning the degree completion and graduation rates of student-athletes;
- "(d) Study and make policy or legislative recommendations to the Management Council concerning relationships between the Association and its Division I members and the nation's two-year colleges as represented by established regional and national organizations;
- "(e) Study and make recommendations to the Management Council concerning the recruiting process in intercollegiate athletics;
- "(f) Determine interpretations of all Division I legislation. The cabinet shall not have the authority to alter an existing Management Council interpretation. Its decision shall be binding unless overturned upon appeal to the Management Council at its next regularly scheduled meeting;
- "(g) Incorporate new Division I legislation and interpretations in the NCAA Manual for the division and approve the publication of supplementary compilations of interpretations, as necessary; and
- "(h) Have the authority under Bylaw 14.13 to determine all matters pertaining to the policies and procedures for the restoration of eligibility of a student-athlete who is ineligible for intercollegiate competition as a result of a violation of Division I legislation, and for waivers of legislation that the committee has been authorized to grant by the division. The procedures for processing such appeals or re-

quests shall be established by the cabinet and approved by the Management Council. The cabinet may restore eligibility immediately, may restore eligibility at a subsequent time or may determine that eligibility should not be restored. The cabinet also may impose conditions for restoration of eligibility.

"21.8.6.2.2.1 Application of Eligibility Rules. In fulfilling the duties set forth in 21.8.6.2.2-(h) above, the following shall apply:

"(a) Authority of Director of Eligibility. Subject to review by the Academics/Eligibility/ Compliance Cabinet, the director of eligibility is authorized to apply the eligibility rules of the division.

"(b) Appeals. After the director of eligibility has acted on an eligibility matter, the involved institution may appeal the decision to the cabinet. The cabinet determination shall be final, binding and conclusive and shall not be subject to further review by the Management Council or any other authority.

"21.8.6.2.3 Committees. The following committees shall report directly to the Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet.

"21.8.6.2.3.1 Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee — Division I.

"21.8.6.2.3.1.1 Composition. The Division I Initial-Eligibility Waivers Committee shall consist of six members appointed by the Academics / Eligibility / Compliance Cabinet.

"21.8.6.2.3.1.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for reviewing requests for waivers of the initial-eligibility requirements in accordance with 14.3.1.7.

"21.8.6.2.3.2 Financial Aid and Amateurism, Division I Committee on.

"21.8.6.2.3.2.1 Composition. The Division I Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism shall consist of six members appointed by the Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet. At least one institutional financial aid officer shall be included on the committee.

"21.8.6.2.3.2.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for review and consideration of those portions of the Division I leg-

islation that relate to principles governing financial aid and amateurism.

"21.8.6.2.3.3 Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse Committee. The Division I members of the common Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse Committee shall be appointed by and report directly to the Academics/Eligibility/ Compliance Cabinet.

"21.8.6.3 Championships/Competition Cabinet.

"21.8.6.3.1 Composition. The Championships/Competition Cabinet shall consist of 34 members, including 18 representing Division I-A (two positions shall be allocated for faculty athletics representatives, five allocated for directors of athletics, five allocated for senior woman administrators and six unallocated) and eight each representing Divisions I-AA and I-AAA (one position in each subdivision shall be allocated for a faculty athletics representative, two allocated for directors of athletics, two allocated for senior woman administrators and three unallocated). Those eligible for the unallocated positions are athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior woman administrators, assistant directors of athletics, conference administrators) and faculty athletics representatives.

"21.8.6.3.2 Duties. The cabinet (or a subcommittee designated by it) shall:

"(a) In championships administration:

"(1) Supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for National Collegiate Championships and Division I championships;

"(2) Maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport and approve appeals for division-specific exceptions to the applicable playing regulations when significant financial impact may occur (subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee);

"(3) Review recommendations from sports committees regarding the administration of those championships;

"(4) Process other issues related to the administration of those championships; and

"(5) Act for the Management Council as the final authority regarding championships matters in Division I or in a National

Collegiate Championship that are subject to appeal to the Management Council (i.e., excluding appeals of championships selection or assignment in championships competition).

“(b) In working with the Association-wide Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports Committee:

“(1) Assist in the collection and development of pertinent information regarding desirable training methods, prevention and treatment of sports injuries, utilization of sound safety measures at the college level, drug education and drug testing;

“(2) Assist in the dissemination of such information as might be brought appropriately to the attention of the division’s membership and adopt recommended policies and standards designed to further the above objectives; and

“(3) Assist in the supervision of the Association’s drug-education and drug-testing programs under the direction of the Executive Committee.

“(c) In other areas:

“(1) Be responsible for issues involving post-season football contests, college all-star football and basketball contests and exempted contests. The Division I-A members shall vote on Division I-A football matters; the Division I-AA members shall vote on Division I-AA football matters, and all members, regardless of subdivision, shall vote on all other matters;

“(2) Be responsible for issues involving personnel limitations in Division I; and

“(3) Be responsible for issues involving playing and practice seasons in Division I sports.

“21.8.6.3.3 Committees. The following committees shall report directly to the Championships/Competition Cabinet.

“21.8.6.3.3.1 Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, Committee on. The Division I members of the Association-wide Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports shall be appointed by and report directly to the Championships/Competition Cabinet.

“21.8.6.3.3.2 Football Issues.

“21.8.6.3.3.2.1 Composition. The Football Issues Committee shall consist of 24 members, including the members of the Division I-AA Football Committee, the Division I members of the Football Rules Committee and one representative from each of the Division I-A football conferences identified in 4.2.1-(a) and (b).

“21.8.6.3.3.2.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for the review of issues related to the sport of football in Division I.

“21.8.6.3.3.3 Sports Committees.

“21.8.6.3.3.3.1 Rules Committees Without Championships Responsibilities. The Division I members of these Association-wide committees shall be appointed by and report directly to the Championships/Competition Cabinet for Division I review of the playing rules developed by those committees, which are applicable to all divisions.

“21.8.6.3.3.3.2 Rules Committees With Championships Responsibilities. The Division I members of these common committees shall be appointed by and report directly to the Championships/Competition Cabinet for Division I review of the playing rules developed by those committees, which are applicable to all divisions. Each committee shall act as one body to formulate playing rules and to administer championships in those sports in which there is only a National Collegiate Championship; Division I members shall be responsible for administering the Division I championships in the sport.

“21.8.6.3.3.3.2.1 Each committee shall develop policies and procedures governing the administration of the NCAA championships under its jurisdiction, subject to the approval of the Championships/Competition Cabinet, and shall control, direct and supervise the conduct of said championships subject to the requirements, standards and conditions prescribed by Bylaw 31. The Men’s and Women’s Track and Field Committee shall be responsible for the Association’s cross country, indoor

track and field, and outdoor track and field championships.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.2.2 Regional Advisory Committees. Regional advisory committees may be appointed by each Division I sports subcommittee as prescribed by the Championships/Competition Cabinet.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3 Committees With Only Championships Administration Responsibilities. These Division I sports committees shall be responsible for administering the Division I championships or National Collegiate Championships in the appropriate sport. Those committees that administer National Collegiate Championships may include representatives from member institutions in Divisions II and III. Those committees administering Division I championships may meet with committees administering championships in the same sport in other divisions as appropriate for the efficient administration of the championships.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.1 Selection, Composition and Duties.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.1.1 Method of Selection. The members and chair of each committee shall be appointed by the Championships/Competition Cabinet.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.1.2 Composition Requirements. For committees that administer championships in individual sports, at least 25 percent of the positions on each sports committee shall be filled by athletics administrators (i.e., athletics directors, associate or assistant athletics directors, senior woman administrators, individuals who are employed full time as administrators by member conferences, or individuals who are employed both part time as administrators by member conferences and full time by member institutions). For committees that administer championships in team sports, at least 50 percent of the

positions on each sports committee shall be filled by athletics administrators.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.1.3 Duties. Each committee shall be responsible for developing policies and procedures governing the administration and conduct of the NCAA championships under its jurisdiction, subject to the approval of the Championships/Competition Cabinet and the requirements, standards and conditions prescribed by Bylaws 31. (Also see Bylaw 31 for committee duties related to the administration of championships.)

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.1.4 Selection Criteria. Each committee shall have the authority to establish championships selection criteria, including requirements to utilize regular-season playing rules that conform with rules used in NCAA championships under its jurisdiction in those sports for which the Association does not maintain playing rules.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.1.5 Regional Advisory Committees. Regional advisory committees may be appointed by each sports committee as prescribed by the Championships/Competition Cabinet.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.2 Baseball Committee, Division I. The Division I Baseball Committee shall consist of nine members, including one member from each of the eight Division I baseball regions and one selected at large.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.3 Basketball Committee, Division I Men's. The Division I Men's Basketball Committee shall consist of nine members, including one member from each of the four Division I men's basketball regions and five selected at large. No more than three committee members shall represent any single region.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.4 Basketball Committee,

Division I Women's. The Division I Women's Basketball Committee shall consist of nine members.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.5 Fencing Committee, Men's and Women's. The Men's and Women's Fencing Committee shall consist of eight members. Four members shall represent men's fencing interests, including one representative from each of the four men's fencing regions. Four members shall represent women's fencing interests, including one representative from each of the four women's fencing regions.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.6 Field Hockey — Division I. The Division I Field Hockey Committee shall consist of six members.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.7 Football Committee, Division I-AA. The Division I-AA Football Committee shall consist of eight members, including one elected from each Division I-AA football region. In the event that there are fewer than four regions, the additional members shall be selected at large.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.8 Golf Committee, Division I Men's and Women's. The Division I Men's and Women's Golf Committee shall consist of 10 members. Six members shall represent men's golf interests. Four members shall represent women's golf interests.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.8.1 Special Operating Rules. The committee shall act as one body to determine general policies for the men's and women's national championships in golf. Subcommittees composed of committee members representing men's golf interests and women's golf interests shall be responsible for administering the respective championships.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.9 Gymnastics Committee, Men's. The Men's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members, including at least two representatives from each of the two men's gymnastics regions (East and West) and two representatives selected at

large. Four members shall be from Division I and two members shall be selected at large.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.10 Gymnastics Committee, Women's. The Women's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members, including three members from Division I, one member from Division II, one member from Division III and one member selected at large.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.11 Ice Hockey Committee, Division I Men's. The Division I Men's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of four members, including two members from the East, comprising Districts 1, 2 and 3, and two members from the West, comprising Districts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.12 Lacrosse Committee, Women's. The Women's Lacrosse Committee shall consist of six members, including three members from Division I, one member from Division II and two members selected at large.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.13 Rowing Committee, Women's. The Women's Rowing Committee shall consist of seven members, including four members from Division I, one member from Division II, one member from Division III and one member selected at large. In Division I, one member shall represent District 1; one member shall represent District 2; one member shall represent District 8; and one member shall represent Districts 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.14 Soccer Committee, Division I Men's. The Division I Men's Soccer Committee shall consist of eight members, including not more than one member from any men's soccer region in Division I.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.15 Soccer Committee, Division I Women's. The Division I Women's Soccer Committee shall consist of eight members.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.3.16 Softball Committee, Division I Women's. The Division I Women's Softball Committee shall consist of six members.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.17 Tennis Committee, Division I Men's and Women's. The Divisions I Men's and Women's Tennis Committee shall consist of 12 members. Six members of the committee shall represent men's tennis interests and six members shall represent women's tennis interests, including four positions allocated for men, four allocated for women and four unallocated.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.18 Volleyball Committee, Men's. The Men's Volleyball Committee shall consist of three members.

"21.8.6.3.3.3.19 Volleyball Committee, Division I Women's. The Division I Women's Volleyball Committee shall consist of eight members, including two representatives from each of the four Division I volleyball regions and at least one athletics administrator from each Division I volleyball region.

"21.8.6.4 Strategic Planning Cabinet.

"21.8.6.4.1 Composition. The Strategic Planning Cabinet shall consist of 26 members, including 14 representing Division I-A (four positions shall be allocated for faculty athletics representatives, four allocated for directors of athletics, four allocated for senior woman administrators and two unallocated) and six each representing Divisions I-AA and I-AAA (one position in each subdivision shall be allocated for a faculty athletics representative, one allocated for a director of athletics, one allocated for a senior woman administrator and three unallocated). Those eligible for the unallocated positions are athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior woman administrators, assistant athletics directors, conference administrators) and faculty athletics representatives.

"21.8.6.4.2 Duties. The cabinet (or a subcommittee designated by it) shall:

- "(a) Identify and examine trends and problems of intercollegiate athletics;
- "(b) Recommend goals;
- "(c) Review and evaluate the activities of Division I;
- "(d) Suggest to the Management Council courses of action that Division I may wish to pursue

and policies the division may wish to develop;

- "(e) Study and make recommendations regarding the division's public relations program;
- "(f) Develop and administer promotional activities for the benefit of the membership, Division I and its championships events;
- "(g) Consider and evaluate television matters affecting the division;
- "(i) Make recommendations concerning appropriate publications and other means of communication concerning the division;
- "(j) Study and make recommendations to the Management Council concerning the relationships between intercollegiate athletics and professional teams and organizations;
- "(k) Make recommendations concerning the distribution of developmental funds from professional sports organizations;
- "(l) Supervise the conduct of organized summer baseball leagues and teams involving student-athletes of member institutions;
- "(m) In conjunction with the Association-wide Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, review issues related to the interests of ethnic minority student-athletes, NCAA minority programs and NCAA policies that affect ethnic minorities;
- "(n) In conjunction with the Association-wide National Youth Sports Program Committee, be responsible for administering the National Youth Sports Program;
- "(o) In conjunction with the Association-wide Olympic Sports Liaison Committee:
 - "(1) Act as a liaison between the division, the U.S. Olympic Committee and national governing bodies; and
 - "(2) Study and make recommendations to the Management Council concerning the division and the Association's appropriate role in the involvement of student-athletes in international athletics.
- "(p) In conjunction with the Association-wide Research Committee:
 - "(1) Evaluate, supervise and coordinate the division's research activities;
 - "(2) Make recommendations to the Business/Finance Cabinet regarding expenditures of funds for research projects; and

"(3) Make recommendations to the Management Council concerning research topics in intercollegiate athletics.

"(q) In conjunction with the Association-wide Committee on Women's Athletics, study and make policy recommendations to the Management Council concerning opportunities for women in athletics at the institutional, conference and national levels, as well as other issues directly affecting women's athletics.

"21.8.6.4.3 Committees. The Division I members of the following Association-wide committees shall be appointed by and report directly to the Strategic Planning Cabinet:

"(a) Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee;

"(b) National Youth Sports Program Committee;

"(c) Olympic Sports Liaison Committee;

"(d) Research Committee; and

"(e) Committee on Women's Athletics.

"21.8.6.5 Business/Finance Cabinet.

"21.8.6.5.1 Composition. The Business/Finance Cabinet shall consist of 26 members, including 14 representing Division I-A (four positions shall be allocated for faculty athletics representatives, four allocated for directors of athletics, four allocated for senior woman administrators and two unallocated) and six each representing Divisions I-AA and I-AAA (one position in each subdivision shall be allocated for a faculty athletics representative, one allocated for a director of athletics, one allocated for a senior woman administrator and three unallocated). Those eligible for the unallocated positions are athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior woman administrators, assistant athletics directors, conference administrators) and faculty athletics representatives.

"21.8.6.5.2 Duties. The cabinet (or a subcommittee designated by it) shall:

"(a) Review and make recommendations concerning the budget of Association revenues available to Division I and expenses incurred by the division;

"(b) Review and make recommendations to the Management Council concerning any proposal from a Division I cabinet or committee that has financial implications for the division;

and

"(c) Review and make recommendations to the Management Council concerning marketing or licensing proposals or activities of the Association or Division I that impact the budget of the division.

"21.8.7 Committees Reporting to Management Council.

"21.8.7.1 General Requirements. The following committees shall report directly to the Management Council.

"21.8.7.2 Athletics Certification, Division I Committee on. The Division I Committee on Athletics Certification shall be appointed as provided in 23.1 and its duties assigned as set forth in 23.1.2. (See Bylaws 23 and 33 for details regarding the committee and the division's procedures related to athletics certification).

"21.8.7.3 Infractions, Division I Committee on. The Division I Committee on Infractions shall be appointed as provided in 19.1 and its duties assigned as set forth in 19.1.3. (See Bylaws 19 and 32 for details regarding the committee and the division's enforcement procedures.)

"21.8.7.4 Infractions Appeals Committee, Division I. The Division I Infractions Appeals Committee shall be appointed and its duties assigned as provided in 19.3 and 32. (See Bylaws 19 and 32 for details regarding the committee and the division's enforcement process.)

"21.8.7.5 Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, Division I.

"21.8.7.5.1 Composition. The Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall consist of one student-athlete from each of the conferences identified in 4.2.1. The members shall be selected by the Management Council from a pool of three nominees from each of the represented conferences.

"21.8.7.5.2 Term of Office. A student-athlete member shall not serve more than two years on the committee but may request reappointment for another two-year term, subject to the Management Council's approval. Student-athletes may serve on the committee up to two years after completion of their intercollegiate athletics eligibility.

"21.8.7.5.3 Role with Management Council. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall designate two of its members to participate in each meeting of the Management Council. Different committee members may be selected for each

Management Council meeting. The designated committee members shall be nonvoting members of the Management Council and the Management Council's agenda shall be arranged so that all matters in which the students participate are included together.

"21.8.7.5.4 Duties. The committee shall receive information on and explanations of Division I activities and legislation, review and react to topics referred to it by other Division I governance entities and comment to the governance structure on any Division I subject of interest.

"21.8.7.6 Honors Committee, Postgraduate Scholarship Committee, Walter Byers Scholarship Committee. Division I members of these Association-wide committees shall be appointed by and report directly to the Management Council on matters related to Division I."

O. Bylaws: Amend 21 by adding new 21.9, page 458, as follows:

[Division II only]

"21.9 DIVISION II COMMITTEES

"21.9.1 Eligibility for Membership.

"21.9.1.1 'On the Staff.' Individuals serving on Division II committees or as Division II representatives on Association-wide or common committees shall be salaried on a regular basis by a Division II institution or conference and performing a regular staff function representing at least 50 percent of the normal workload for a staff member at that institution or conference, unless otherwise specified.

"21.9.1.1.1 Modification in Employment Status. If a committee member's employment status is altered to the extent that the individual no longer meets this requirement, the individual shall be replaced on the committee at the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council meetings immediately following the change in status.

"21.9.1.1.2 Individuals on Sabbatical or Temporary Leave. An individual on sabbatical or other temporary leave for a period not exceeding 12 consecutive months may be considered to be 'on the staff' and eligible for committee membership. An individual on terminal leave or on leave in excess of 12 consecutive months shall not be eligible to serve on a committee.

"21.9.2 Term of Office.

"21.9.2.1 Four-Year Term. Unless otherwise specified, the Division II members of committees shall be ap-

pointed or elected for one four-year term. Unless otherwise specified, a member's term of service shall commence on the first day of September following the member's election or appointment.

"21.9.2.2 Appointment or Election. Unless otherwise specified, the Division II members of committees will be appointed or elected by the Division II Management Council, subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council. Unless otherwise specified, a former committee member may be appointed or elected to an additional term on that committee after three years have elapsed. Unless otherwise specified, an individual who has served two terms on a committee may not serve further on that committee. A member serving more than one-half of a four-year term is ineligible to seek immediate reelection.

"21.9.2.2.1 Appointment or Election of Chairs. Unless otherwise specified, chairs of Division II specific committees shall be elected by the committees themselves for a term not to exceed two years. A chair is not eligible for immediate reelection to the position of chair.

"21.9.2.3 Appointment to Fill Vacancies. Whenever a vacancy occurs among the members of a Division II committee or among the Division II members of Association-wide or common committees, the Division II Management Council, subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council, may fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term by a majority vote of its members present and voting.

"21.9.2.3.1 Unexpired Portion of Term. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term. Members who serve more than one-half of a term in such instances shall be considered to have served a full term.

"21.9.2.4 Adjustments to Achieve Staggered Terms. Members may be appointed for less than full terms whenever it is necessary to adjust the membership of a committee to ensure that vacancies occur in proper sequence. Members who serve more than one-half of a term in such instances shall be considered to have served a full term.

"21.9.2.5 Division II Management Council Representation. All Division II committees with fewer than seven members that report directly to the Management Council shall include at least one Management Council member, and Division II committees with more than six members that report directly to the Management Council shall include at least two Management

Council members. In addition, at least one of the Division II representatives on committees functioning in an Association-wide capacity shall be a member of the Management Council. Management Council members shall serve as the liaisons for each committee to the Management Council. Unless otherwise specified, Management Council members shall serve as voting members of such committees. A Management Council member's term of service shall commence in January following adjournment of the annual Convention and shall be concurrent with his or her term of service on the Management Council. A Management Council member must terminate service on such a committee at the expiration of his or her term on the Management Council.

"21.9.3 Removal From Committee. The chair of each committee is authorized to recommend to the Division II Management Council that a member be replaced if such member is not discharging the member's duties properly. In addition, a member who is absent from two consecutive meetings without reasons approved by the Management Council shall be removed from the committee. The Management Council shall have authority to appoint a replacement for the unexpired portion of the term.

"21.9.4 Conflict of Interest. A committee member shall not participate in the committee's discussion or vote on any action that might bring direct or indirect financial benefit to the member or any organization in which the member is financially interested (other than the member's institution or the conference of which it is a member). A violation of this rule by a member of a committee shall not invalidate the action taken by the committee if, following disclosure of the conflict of interest, the committee authorizes, ratifies or approves the action by a vote sufficient for the purpose, without counting the vote of the committee member with the conflict of interest, and the Management Council approves such action.

"21.9.5 Meeting Length and Sites. The Management Council, subject to ratification by the Presidents Council, is responsible for developing policies governing the length, sites and expenses related to Division II committee meetings (see 31.7.2). Such policies shall be published annually in the NCAA Committee Handbook.

"21.9.6 Division II General Committees. To conduct Division II business in an efficient and orderly fashion, the following Division II committees shall be established and shall report directly to the Division II Management Council.

"21.9.6.1 Academic Requirements Committee.

"21.9.6.1.1 Composition. The Division II Academic Requirements Committee shall consist of nine members, including two members of the Division II Management Council and at least one member representing the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

"21.9.6.1.2 Duties. The committee shall:

- "(a) Review and consider those portions of the Association's constitution and bylaws that affect Division II and relate to principles of sound academic requirements;
- "(b) Study and create policies or legislative recommendations to forward to the Division II Management Council concerning relationships between Division II and its members and the nation's two-year colleges as represented by established regional and national organizations;
- "(c) Review freshman eligibility requirements and establish procedures for granting waivers of such requirements;
- "(d) Monitor procedures for gathering data on membership persistence and graduation rates and report the findings from the study of such rates; and
- "(e) Be represented on the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse Committee by the chair of the Division II Academic Requirements Committee.

"21.9.6.2 Division II Championships Committee.

"21.9.6.2.1 Composition. The Division II Championships Committee shall consist of 11 members, including the vice-chair and one other member of the Division II Management Council.

"21.9.6.2.1.1 Chair. The vice-chair of the Division II Management Council shall serve as chair of the Championships Committee.

"21.9.6.2.2 Duties. The committee shall:

- "(a) Make budgetary recommendations to the Division II Management Council for the conduct of Division II championships;
- "(b) Supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for Division II championships;
- "(c) Maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport and approve appeals for exceptions to the applicable playing regulations when significant financial impact may occur (subject to the final authority of

the Division II Presidents Council);

- “(d) Review and act upon recommendations from Division II sports committees regarding the administration of those championships;
- “(e) Process other issues related to the administration of the events;
- “(f) Act for the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council as the final authority regarding championships matters in Division II that are subject to appeal;
- “(g) Maintain responsibility for issues involving college all-star football and basketball contests; and
- “(h) Select sports committee representatives, subject to ratification by the Division II Management Council.

“21.9.6.2.2.1 Recommendations From Division II Sports Committees. All Division II sports committees report directly to the Division II Championships Committee. All sports committee recommendations shall be processed through the Championships Committee, then to the Management Council and are subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council.

“21.9.6.3 Infractions, Division II Committee on.

“21.9.6.3.1 Composition. The Division II Committee on Infractions shall consist of five members, including one member of the Division II Management Council, and one individual from the general public who is not associated with a collegiate institution, conference, professional or similar sports organization, or who represents coaches or athletes in any capacity.

“21.9.6.3.2 Term of Office. A member shall serve a four-year term and shall be eligible for immediate reelection. A member may not serve more than two terms on the committee.

“21.9.6.3.3 Duties. The committee shall:

- “(a) Consider complaints that may be filed with the Association charging the failure of any Division II member to maintain the academic or athletics standards required for membership or the failure of any Division II member to meet the conditions and obligations of membership in the Association;
- “(b) Formulate and revise in accordance with the requirements of 19.4, a statement of its established operating policies and procedures, including investigative guidelines (see Bylaw

32);

- “(c) Determine facts related to alleged violations and find violations of NCAA rules and requirements;
- “(d) Refer consideration of a case or any portion of a case involving disputed facts to a hearing officer;
- “(e) Impose an appropriate penalty or ‘show-cause’ requirement on a Division II member found to be involved in a major violation (or upon appeal on a Division II member found to be involved in a secondary violation) or recommend to the Division II Management Council suspension or termination of membership, subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council; and
- “(f) Carry out any other duties directly related to the administration of the Division II enforcement program.

“21.9.6.3.4 Authority of Infractions Committee. Disciplinary or corrective actions other than suspension or termination of membership may be effected during the period between the Division II business session of the annual Convention by members of the infractions committee present and voting at any duly called meeting thereof, provided the call of such a meeting shall have contained notice of the situation presenting the disciplinary problem. Actions of the committee in cases involving major violations, however, shall be subject to review by the Division II Management Council per 19.3, on appeal.

“21.9.6.3.5 Authority of Group Executive Director for Enforcement and Eligibility Appeals. Upon review of information developed by the enforcement staff or self-reported by the member institution, the group executive director for enforcement and eligibility appeals shall identify the charges as involving alleged major or secondary violations, or repeated secondary violations that should be viewed as a major violation, subject to approval by the committee chair or another member of the committee designated by the chair. Disciplinary or corrective actions in the case of secondary violations may be effected by the group executive director for enforcement and eligibility appeals, subject to approval by the committee chair or another member of the committee designated by the chair. Said actions shall be taken in accordance with the provisions of the enforce-

ment policies and procedures and shall be subject to review by the committee upon appeal.

"21.9.6.3.6 Authority of Committee Chair. In the interim between meetings of the committee, the chair shall be empowered to act on behalf of the committee, subject to committee approval at its next meeting. If at any time, at a meeting or between meetings, the chair is unavailable to act as such, the member of the committee longest in service who is available is empowered to exercise the functions of the chair.

"21.9.6.3.7 Authority of Management Council. The Management Council per 19.3 shall hear and act upon an institution's appeal of the findings of major violations by the committee.

"21.9.6.4 Division II Eligibility Committee.

"21.9.6.4.1 Composition. The Division II Eligibility Committee shall consist of five members, including one member of the Division II Management Council.

"21.9.6.4.2 Duties. The committee shall have the authority under Bylaw 14.12 to determine all matters pertaining to the policies and procedures for the restoration of eligibility of a Division II student-athlete who is ineligible for intercollegiate competition as a result of an NCAA rules violation, and for waivers of legislation that the Division II Management Council or membership has authorized the committee to grant.

"21.9.6.4.2.1 Procedures. The procedures for processing such appeals or requests shall be established by the Division II Eligibility Committee and approved by the Division II Management Council. The committee may restore eligibility immediately, may restore eligibility at a subsequent time or may determine that eligibility should not be restored. The committee also may impose conditions for restorations of eligibility.

"21.9.6.4.2.2 Authority of Director of Eligibility. Subject to review by the Division II Eligibility Committee, the director of eligibility is authorized to apply the Division II eligibility rules.

"21.9.6.4.2.3 Appeals. After the director of eligibility has acted on an eligibility matter, the involved Division II institution may appeal the decision to the Division II Eligibility Committee. The committee's determination shall

be final, binding and conclusive and shall not be subject to further review by the Division II Management Council or any other authority.

"21.9.6.5 Division II Legislation Committee.

"21.9.6.5.1 Composition. The Division II Legislation Committee shall consist of 11 members, including two members of the Division II Management Council.

"21.9.6.5.2 Duties. The committee shall:

- "(a) Determine interpretations of all Division II specific legislation;**
- "(b) Incorporate new legislation and interpretations in the NCAA Manual;**
- "(c) Review deregulation issues in consultation with other Division II committees;**
- "(d) Approve the publication of supplementary compilations of interpretations; and**
- "(e) Review and consider legislative issues of those portions of the Association's constitution and bylaws that relate to the principles governing financial aid and amateurism, professional sports relations, recruiting, personnel limitations, and playing and practice seasons.**

"21.9.6.6 Division II Membership Committee.

"21.9.6.6.1 Composition. The Division II Membership Committee shall consist of seven members, including two members of the Division II Management Council.

"21.9.6.6.2 Duties. The committee shall:

- "(a) Review and consider issues pertaining to the Division II membership requirements and membership compliance; and**
- "(b) Handle Convention tasks related to Division II business, which include examining the credentials of Division II delegates, determining (subject to appeal of the Division II membership) the authority of any Division II delegate to vote or otherwise represent a member institution at an annual or special Convention and counting the votes at an annual or special Convention.**

"21.9.6.7 Division II Nominating Committee.

"21.9.6.7.1 Composition. The Division II Nominating Committee shall consist of 11 members, including two members of the Division II Management Council.

"21.9.6.7.2 Duties. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, as well as diversity by position and conference affiliation, the committee shall present to the Division II Management Council nominations for vacancies on all Division II specific committees, including men's and women's sports committees, and for the Division II positions on committees functioning in an Association-wide or multidivisional capacity.

"21.9.6.8 Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

"21.9.6.8.1 Composition. The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall consist of one representative from each of the Division II multi-sport voting conferences, one representative of Division II independent institutions, two at-large positions to enhance efforts to achieve diversity of representation and two members of the Division II Management Council. A student-athlete representative must be a full-time undergraduate or graduate student at a Division II institution, as defined by the regulations of the institution, and must be a student-athlete or a former student-athlete in a Division II sport. The two Management Council members shall serve as ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee.

"21.9.6.8.2 Vacancies. When a vacancy on the committee occurs, the applicable conference shall nominate two student-athletes, each from different active member institutions in the conference. Nominations for the independent position and at-large positions will be solicited by the Division II Nominating Committee. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, as well as diversity by sports participation, student-athlete representatives shall be selected by the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee from the slate of nominees, subject to ratification by the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council.

"21.9.6.8.3 Term of Office. A student-athlete representative shall not serve more than two years on the committee but may request reappointment for another two-year term, subject to the conference's recommendation and the chair's approval. Student-athletes may serve on the committee up to two years after completion of their intercollegiate athletics eligibility. A Management Council representative's term of office shall be concurrent with his or her term of service on the Management Council.

"21.9.6.8.4 Duties. The committee shall receive information on and explanations of NCAA activities and legislation pertaining to Division II and, in consultation with the Division II Management Council, shall review and react to topics referred to it by other Division II committees and by the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council, participate in an annual summit with the Division II Management Council and participate in the Division II legislative process through involvement at the annual Convention.

"21.9.7 Sports Committees With Only Division II Championships Administration Responsibilities. To conduct Division II championships in an efficient and orderly fashion, Division II sports committees shall be established and will report directly to the Division II Championships Committee (see 21.9.6.2).

"21.9.7.1 Selection, Composition and Duties.

"21.9.7.1.1 Method of Selection. The members of each Division II sports committee and the Division II representatives on Association-wide and common rules committees shall be nominated by the Division II Nominating Committee and shall be selected by the Division II Championships Committee, subject to ratification by the Division II Management Council.

"21.9.7.1.2 Composition Requirements. For sports committees in both team and individual sports that administer Division II championships and for Division II representatives on Association-wide and common rules committees, at least 50 percent of the positions on each committee shall be filled by athletics administrators (i.e., athletics directors, associate or assistant athletics directors, senior woman administrators, individuals who are employed full time as administrators by member conferences, or individuals who are employed both part time as administrators by member conferences and full time by member institutions). An institutional staff member who performs both coaching and administrative functions may be counted as either an athletics administrator or a coach.

"21.9.7.1.3 Duties. Each Division II sports committee shall be responsible for developing policies, procedures and selection criteria governing the administration and conduct of the NCAA Division II championships under its jurisdiction and shall be responsible for administering such championships (subject to the approval of the Division II

Championships Committee and the Division II Management Council, subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council) and the requirements, standards and conditions prescribed by Bylaw 31. (Also see Bylaw 31 for committee duties related to the administration of championships.)

"21.9.7.1.4 Selection Criteria. Each Division II sports committee shall have the authority to establish championships selection criteria (subject to the approval of the Division II Championships Committee and the Division II Management Council, subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council) including requirements to utilize regular-season playing rules that conform with rules used in NCAA championships under its jurisdiction in those sports for which the Association does not maintain playing rules.

"21.9.7.1.5 Regional Advisory Committees. Regional advisory committees may be appointed by each sports committee as prescribed by the Division II Championships Committee, as ratified by the Division II Management Council.

"21.9.7.2 Baseball Committee — Division II. The Division II Baseball Committee shall consist of eight members.

"21.9.7.3 Basketball Committee, Men's — Division II. The Division II Men's Basketball Committee shall consist of eight members.

"21.9.7.4 Basketball Committee, Women's — Division II. The Division II Women's Basketball Committee shall consist of eight members.

"21.9.7.5 Field Hockey — Division II. The Division II Field Hockey Committee shall consist of three members.

"21.9.7.6 Football Committee — Division II. The Division II Football Committee shall consist of four members. One member shall be elected from each of the four Division II football regions.

"21.9.7.7 Golf Committee, Men's — Division II. The Division II Men's Golf Committee shall consist of three members.

"21.9.7.8 Ice Hockey Committee, Men's — Division II. The Division II Men's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of three members.

"21.9.7.9 Lacrosse Committee, Men's — Division II. The Division II Men's Lacrosse Committee shall consist of the Division II representative to the common Men's Lacrosse Committee with playing rules and

championships administration responsibilities (see 21.5.2) and two additional members.

"21.9.7.10 Soccer Committee, Men's — Division II. The Division II Men's Soccer Committee shall consist of four members.

"21.9.7.11 Soccer Committee, Women's — Division II. The Division II Women's Soccer Committee shall consist of four members.

"21.9.7.12 Softball Committee, Women's — Division II. The Division II Women's Softball Committee shall consist of eight members.

"21.9.7.13 Swimming and Diving Committee, Men's and Women's — Division II. The Division II Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee shall consist of the four Division II representatives to the common Men's and Women's Swimming Committee with playing rules and championships administration responsibilities (see 21.5.5).

"21.9.7.14 Tennis Committee, Men's and Women's — Division II. The Division II Men's and Women's Tennis Committee shall consist of six members. Three members of the committee shall represent men's tennis interests and three members shall represent women's tennis interests, including two positions allocated for men, two allocated for women and two unallocated.

"21.9.7.15 Track and Field Committee, Men's and Women's — Division II. The Division II Track and Field Committee shall consist of the six Division II representatives to the common Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee with playing rules and championships administration responsibilities (see 21.5.6).

"21.9.7.15.1 Track and Field. The Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee shall be responsible for the Division II cross country, indoor track and field, and outdoor track and field championships. (See Bylaw 31 for committee duties related to the administration of championships.)

"21.9.7.16 Volleyball Committee, Women's — Division II. The Division II Women's Volleyball Committee shall consist of eight members.

"21.9.7.17 Wrestling Committee — Division II. The Division II Wrestling Committee shall consist of the three Division II representatives to the common Wrestling Committee with playing rules and championships administration responsibilities (see 21.5.8)."

P. Bylaws: Amend 21 by adding new 21.10, page 458, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"21.10 DIVISION III COMMITTEES

"21.10.1 Eligibility for Membership.

"21.10.1.1 'On the Staff.' Individuals serving on Division III committees or as Division III representatives on Association-wide or common committees shall be salaried on a regular basis by a Division III institution or conference and perform a regular staff function representing at least 50 percent of the normal workload for a staff member at that institution or conference, unless otherwise specified.

"21.10.1.1.1 Modification in Employment Status. If a committee member's employment status is altered to the extent that the individual no longer meets this requirement, the individual shall be replaced on the committee at the Division III Management Council and Presidents Council meetings immediately following the change in status.

"21.10.1.1.2 Individuals on Sabbatical or Temporary Leave. An individual on sabbatical or other temporary leave for a period not exceeding 12 consecutive months may be considered to be 'on the staff' and eligible for committee membership. An individual on terminal leave or on leave in excess of 12 consecutive months shall not be eligible to serve on a committee.

"21.10.1.1.3 Waiver of Replacement Requirement. The Management Council, subject to ratification by the Presidents Council, shall have the authority to waive this provision or to approve a later replacement date if it deems that application of 21.10.1.1.1 would be detrimental to the work of the committee involved.

"21.10.1.2 One Member Per Playing Conference. The membership of a Division III 'playing conference' (i.e., one that conducts a regular conference schedule or a postseason tournament to determine its champion in football or basketball) may not be represented on any committee by more than one individual.

"21.10.1.3 Vacancies. A representative of a playing conference or member institution whose term of service on a committee has expired shall not be replaced on that committee by another representative of the same conference or institution.

"21.10.1.4 Sports Committees. Selection and Composition.

"21.10.1.4.1 Method of Selection. The Division III members of each common committee per 21.5 and 21.6, and each Division III sports committee per

21.10.7 shall be nominated by the Nominating Committee, by the applicable committee or by the membership. The members shall be appointed by the Championships Committee, subject to final approval by the Management Council and the Presidents Council.

"21.10.1.4.2 Composition Requirements. At least 50 percent of the positions on each team sports committee and at least 25 percent of the positions on each individual sports committee shall be filled by athletics administrators (i.e., athletics directors, associate or assistant athletics directors, senior woman administrators, individuals who are employed full time as administrators by member conferences, or individuals who are employed both part time as administrators by member conferences and full time by member institutions) who also do not serve as institutional coaching staff members in that Division III sport.

"21.10.2 Term of Office.

"21.10.2.1 Four-Year Term. Unless otherwise specified, the Division III members of committees shall be appointed or elected for one four-year term. Unless otherwise specified, the terms of service of general committee members (per 21.10.6) shall commence in January following the adjournment of the annual NCAA Convention following the member's election or appointment. The terms of service of all other committee members shall commence on the first day of September following the member's election or appointment.

"21.10.2.2 Appointment or Election. Unless otherwise specified, the Division III members of committees will be appointed or elected by the Management Council. Unless otherwise specified, a former committee member may be appointed or elected to an additional term on that committee after three years have elapsed. Unless otherwise specified, an individual who has served two terms on a committee may not serve further on that committee. A member serving more than one-half of a four-year term is ineligible to seek immediate reelection.

"21.10.2.2.1 Appointment or Election of Chairs. Unless otherwise specified, chairs of Division III committees shall be elected by the committees themselves for a term not to exceed two years. A chair is not eligible for immediate reelection to the position of chair. The chair of each committee shall have the privilege of voting on any issue considered by the committee.

"21.10.2.3 Appointment to Fill Vacancies. Whenever a vacancy occurs among the members of a Division III committee or among the Division III members of Association-wide or common committees, the Management Council shall fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term by a majority vote of its members present and voting.

"21.10.2.3.1 Unexpired Portion of Term. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term. Members who serve more than one-half of a term in such instances shall be considered to have served a full term.

"21.10.2.4 Adjustments to Achieve Staggered Terms. Members may be appointed for less than full terms whenever it is necessary to adjust the membership of a committee to ensure that vacancies occur in proper sequence. Members who serve more than one-half of a term in such instances shall be considered to have served a full term.

"21.10.2.5 Management Council Representation. All general committees (per 21.10.6) shall include at least one Management Council member. In addition, at least one of the Division III representatives on general committees functioning in an Association-wide capacity shall be a member of the Management Council. Management Council members will serve as a liaison for each committee to the Management Council. Unless otherwise specified, Management Council members will serve as voting members of such committees. A Management Council member's term of service shall commence in January following adjournment of the annual Convention and shall be concurrent with his or her remaining term of service on the Management Council. A Management Council member must terminate service on such a committee at the expiration of the member's term on the Management Council.

"21.10.3 Removal From Committee. The chair of each committee is authorized to recommend to the Management Council that a member be replaced if such member is not discharging the member's duties properly.

"21.10.4 Conflict of Interest. A committee member shall not participate in the committee's discussion or vote on any action that might bring direct or indirect financial benefit to the member or any organization in which the member is financially interested (other than the member's institution or the conference of which it is a member). A violation of this rule by a member of a committee shall not invalidate the action taken by the committee if,

following disclosure of the conflict of interest, the committee authorizes, ratifies or approves the action by a vote sufficient for the purpose, without counting the vote of the committee member with the conflict of interest, and the Management Council approves such action.

"21.10.5 Meeting Length and Sites. The Management Council, subject to ratification by the Presidents Council, is responsible for developing policies governing the length, sites and expenses related to Division III committee meetings (see 31.7.2). Such policies shall be published annually in the NCAA Committee Handbook.

"21.10.6 General Committees. To conduct Division III business in an efficient and orderly fashion, the following general committees shall be established and will report directly to the Management Council.

"21.10.6.1 Division III Budget Committee.

"21.10.6.1.1 Composition. The Budget Committee shall consist of eight members, including the vice-chair of the Presidents Council; an additional member of the Presidents Council; the vice-chair of the Management Council; an additional member of the Management Council; a member of the Championships Committee; an 'at-large' Division III chief executive officer who does not serve on the Presidents Council, Management Council or Championships Committee; and two 'at-large' athletics administrators who do not serve on the Management Council or Championships Committee.

"21.10.6.1.2 Term of Office. 'At-large' members shall serve a maximum of one four-year term. The terms of the other members shall coincide with their terms on those bodies.

"21.10.6.1.3 Chair. The vice-chair of the Presidents Council shall serve as chair.

"21.10.6.1.4 Duties. The committee shall review all budgetary requests forwarded by the Division III Management Council related to the annual Division III budget and shall forward budgetary recommendations to the Division III Management Council. The committee also shall monitor the administration of the annual Division III budget and report to the Management Council on a regular basis regarding that topic.

"21.10.6.2 Division III Championships Committee.

"21.10.6.2.1 Composition. The Championships Committee shall consist of nine members, including the chair of the Management Council and four other Management Council members. The com-

mittee shall include at least four men, at least four women, at least one student-athlete, and at least one member of an ethnic minority. At least one committee member shall represent each of the eight districts specified in 4.8.1. Terms of the Management Council members shall coincide with their terms on that body.

"21.10.6.2.2 Duties. The committee shall:

- "(a)** Make budgetary recommendations to the Management Council for the conduct of Division III championships;
- "(b)** Supervise qualifications and/or selection procedures for those events;
- "(c)** Maintain oversight responsibilities for applicable playing regulations in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport and approve appeals for division-specific exceptions to the applicable playing regulations when significant financial impact may occur (subject to the final authority of the Management Council);
- "(d)** Review recommendations from sports committees regarding the administration of those championships;
- "(e)** Process other issues related to the administration of the events;
- "(f)** Act as the final authority regarding championships matters in Division III that are subject to appeal (i.e., excluding appeals of championships selection or assignment in championships competition); and
- "(g)** Appoint the members of the Division III sports committees, subject to the final approval of the Management Council and the Presidents Council.

"21.10.6.3 Division III Eligibility and Infractions Committee.

"21.10.6.3.1 Composition. The committee shall be composed of 10 members. Nine shall be on the staff of an active Division III member institution or member conference of the Association. One shall be from the general public and shall not be associated with a collegiate institution, conference, professional or similar sports organization or represent coaches or athletes in any capacity. At least one of the positions shall be allocated for a member of an ethnic minority. Five positions shall be allocated for men and five allocated for women.

"21.10.6.3.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for the administration of the Division III eligibility and infractions programs.

"21.10.6.3.3 Subcommittees. The committee shall be divided into two subcommittees composed of five members each. One member of each subcommittee shall serve as subcommittee chair and shall serve as committee cochair.

"21.10.6.3.3.1 Eligibility Subcommittee. The eligibility subcommittee shall be composed of five members, including one member from the Division III Management Council.

"21.10.6.3.3.1.1 Quorum. Three members present and voting shall constitute a quorum to conduct subcommittee business, it being understood that the chair shall make a special effort to have full subcommittee attendance.

"21.10.6.3.3.1.2 Duties. The subcommittee shall have the authority under Bylaw 14.12 to determine all matters pertaining to the policies and procedures for the restoration of eligibility of a student-athlete who is ineligible for intercollegiate competition as a result of an NCAA rules violation, and for waivers of legislation that the Management Council or the membership has authorized the subcommittee to grant. The procedures for processing such appeals or requests shall be established by the subcommittee and approved by the Management Council. The subcommittee may restore eligibility immediately, may restore eligibility at a subsequent time or may determine that eligibility should not be restored. The subcommittee also may impose conditions for restoration of eligibility.

"21.10.6.3.3.1.3 Authority of Director of Eligibility. Subject to review by the Eligibility subcommittee, the director of eligibility is authorized to apply the eligibility rules of the Association.

"21.10.6.3.3.1.4 Appeals. After the group executive director for enforcement and eligibility appeals has acted on an eligibility matter, the involved institution may appeal the decision to the Eligibility Subcommittee. Its determination shall be final, binding and conclusive, and shall not be

subject to further review by the Management Council or any other authority.

"21.10.6.3.3.2 Infractions Subcommittee. The Infractions Subcommittee shall be composed of five members, including one member from the Division III Management Council and one member from the general public.

"21.10.6.3.3.2.1 Quorum. Three members present and voting shall constitute a quorum to conduct subcommittee business, it being understood that the chair shall make a special effort to have full subcommittee attendance when major infractions cases involving major violations are to be considered.

"21.10.6.3.3.2.2 Duties. The duties of the subcommittee shall be as follows:

- "(a)** Consider complaints that may be filed with the Association charging the failure of any Division III member to maintain the academic or athletics standards required for membership or the failure of any Division III member to meet the conditions and obligations of membership in the Association;
- "(b)** Formulate and revise, in accordance with the requirements of 19.4, a statement of its established operating policies and procedures, including investigative guidelines (see Bylaw 32);
- "(c)** Determine facts related to alleged violations and find violations of NCAA rules;
- "(d)** Refer to a hearing officer consideration of a case or any portion of a case involving disputed facts;
- "(e)** Impose an appropriate penalty or show-cause requirement on a member found to be involved in a major violation (or, upon appeal, on a member found to be involved in a secondary violation), or recommend to the Council suspension or termination of membership; and
- "(f)** Carry out any other duties directly related to the administration of the Division III enforcement program.

"21.10.6.3.3.2.3 Temporary Substitutes. If it appears that one or more members of the

subcommittee will be unable to participate in the hearing of a case, the chair may request the Division III Management Council to designate a former member or members of the subcommittee to rejoin the subcommittee for purposes of the consideration and disposition of that case.

"21.10.6.3.3.2.4 Authority of Infractions Subcommittee. Disciplinary or corrective actions other than suspension or termination of membership may be effected during the period between Division III business sessions of the annual Convention by members of the infractions subcommittee present and voting at any duly called meeting thereof, provided the call of such a meeting shall have contained notice of the situation presenting the disciplinary problem. Actions of the subcommittee in cases involving major violations, however, shall be subject to review by the appropriate appeals committee per 19.3, on appeal.

"21.10.6.3.3.2.5 Authority of Group Executive Director for Enforcement and Eligibility Appeals. Upon review of information developed by the enforcement staff or self-reported by the member institution, the group executive director for enforcement and eligibility appeals shall identify the charges as involving alleged major or secondary violations, or repeated secondary violations that should be viewed as a major violation, subject to approval by the subcommittee chair or another member of the subcommittee designated by the chair. Disciplinary or corrective actions in the case of secondary violations may be effected by the group executive director for enforcement and eligibility appeals, subject to approval by the subcommittee chair or another member of the subcommittee designated by the chair. Said actions shall be taken in accordance with the provisions of the enforcement policies and procedures and shall be subject to review by the subcommittee upon appeal.

"21.10.6.3.3.2.6 Authority of Subcommittee Chair. In the interim between meetings of the subcommittee, the chair shall be em-

powered to act on behalf of the subcommittee, subject to subcommittee approval at its next meeting. If at any time, at a meeting or between meetings, the chair is unavailable to act as such, the member of the subcommittee longest in service who is available is empowered to exercise the functions of the chair.

"21.10.6.3.3.2.7 Authority of Management Council. The Management Council per 19.3 shall hear and act upon an institution's appeal of the findings of major violations by the subcommittee.

"21.10.6.4 Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee.

"21.10.6.4.1 Composition. The Financial Aid and Awards Committee shall consist of nine members. Two members shall be financial aid administrators, one shall be a member of the Management Council, one shall be a student-athlete representative and at least one shall be a member of an ethnic minority. At least four positions shall be allocated for men and at least four allocated for women.

"21.10.6.4.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for the review and consideration of the Division III bylaws that govern financial aid and financial awards and report to the Management Council on a regular basis regarding that topic.

"21.10.6.5 Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

"21.10.6.5.1 Composition. The Interpretations and Legislation Committee shall consist of seven members. One shall be a member of the Management Council, one shall be a student-athlete representative and at least one shall be a member of an ethnic minority. At least three positions shall be allocated for men and at least three allocated for women.

"21.10.6.5.2 Duties. The committee shall determine interpretations of all Division III legislation. The committee also shall review and refine legislative proposals, incorporate new legislation and interpretations, review deregulation issues and approve the publication of supplementary compilations of interpretations.

"21.10.6.5.3 Special Operating Rules. The committee shall not have the authority to alter an existing Management Council interpretation. Its decision shall be binding unless overturned upon appeal to the Management Council or Presidents Council at its next regularly scheduled meeting, or at the Division III business session of the annual Convention.

"21.10.6.6 Division III Membership Committee.

"21.10.6.6.1 Composition. The Membership Committee shall consist of nine members. One shall be a Management Council member and at least one shall be a member of an ethnic minority. At least four positions shall be allocated for men and at least four positions shall be allocated for women. At least one member shall be appointed from each of the eight geographical regions per 4.8.1.

"21.10.6.6.2 Duties. The committee shall review issues related to Division III membership, including issues and educational efforts affecting provisional and continuing members.

"21.10.6.7 Division III Nominating Committee.

"21.10.6.7.1 Composition. The Nominating Committee shall consist of eight members, including at least four former NCAA officers or former members of the NCAA Council or Management Council, one current member of the Management Council, and one chief executive officer who is a current or former member of the Management Council. The committee shall include at least four men, at least four women, and at least one member of an ethnic minority.

"21.10.6.7.2 Chair. The chair shall be appointed from among the former NCAA officers or Council or Management Council members serving on the committee.

"21.10.6.7.3 Duties. The committee shall coordinate nominations for the Division III Management Council, all standing committees that report to the Management Council, all Division III sports committees and all Division III positions on Association-wide and common committees.

"21.10.6.8 Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

"21.10.6.8.1 Composition. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall consist of 24 members, including at least two members from each of the eight geographical regions per 4.9.2.2 and eight members serving at large. The committee shall include at least 12 men, at least 12 women, and at least three members of ethnic minorities. No more than two student-athletes

from the same playing conference (one male, one female) may be committee members. Two Management Council members shall serve as ex officio members of the committee.

"21.10.6.8.2 Term of Office. A student-athlete member shall not serve more than two years on the committee but may be reappointed for another two-year term, subject to the chair's approval. Student-athletes may serve on the committee up to two years after completion of their intercollegiate athletics eligibility.

"21.10.6.8.3 Management Council Service. The committee annually shall elect two members (one male, one female) to serve on the Management Council. To be eligible for Management Council service, committee members shall have completed at least one year of service on the committee. Committee members shall be eligible for no more than two years of service on the Management Council.

"21.10.6.8.4 Duties The committee shall receive information on and explanations of NCAA activities and legislation and shall review and react to topics referred to it by other Association committees and by the Council.

"21.10.7 Sports Committees With Only Championships Administration Responsibilities. To conduct Division III championships in an efficient and orderly fashion, sports committees with only championships administrative responsibilities shall be established and shall report directly to the Championships Committee (see 21.10.6.2).

"21.10.7.1 Duties. Each committee shall be responsible for developing policies and procedures governing the administration and conduct of the championships under its jurisdiction, subject to the direction and approval of the Championships Committee and the requirements, standards and conditions prescribed by Bylaw 31. (Also see Bylaw 31 for committee duties related to the administration of championships).

"21.10.7.2 Special Operating Rules. Each committee shall act as one body to determine general policies for the administration of championships.

"21.10.7.3 Selection Criteria. Each committee shall have the authority to establish championships selection criteria, including requirements to utilize regular-season playing rules that conform with rules used in NCAA championships under its jurisdiction in those sports for which the Association does not maintain playing rules.

"21.10.7.4 Regional Advisory Committees. Regional advisory committees may be appointed by each

sports committee as prescribed by the Championships Committee.

"21.10.7.5 Baseball Committee, Division III. The Baseball Committee shall consist of eight members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III baseball regions.

"21.10.7.6 Basketball Committee, Division III Men's. The Men's Basketball Committee shall consist of eight members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III men's basketball regions.

"21.10.7.7 Basketball Committee, Division III Women's. The Women's Basketball Committee shall consist of eight members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III women's basketball regions.

"21.10.7.8 Field Hockey Committee, Division III. The Field Hockey Committee shall consist of six members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III field hockey regions.

"21.10.7.9 Football Committee, Division III. The Football Committee shall consist of eight members. Two members shall be elected from each of the four Division III football regions.

"21.10.7.10 Golf Committee, Division III Men's. The Men's Golf Committee shall consist of six members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III men's golf regions.

"21.10.7.11 Ice Hockey Committee, Division III Men's. The Men's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of four representatives, including two members from the East, comprising Districts 1, 2 and 3, and two members from the West, comprising Districts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

"21.10.7.12 Lacrosse Committee, Division III Men's. The Men's Lacrosse Committee shall consist of the Division III representatives to the common Men's Lacrosse Committee with playing rules and championships administration responsibilities (see 21.5.2) and one other member. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III men's lacrosse regions.

"21.10.7.13 Lacrosse Committee, Division III Women's. The Women's Lacrosse Committee shall consist of four members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III women's lacrosse regions.

"21.10.7.14 Soccer Committee, Division III Men's. The Men's Soccer Committee shall consist of eight members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III men's soccer regions.

"21.10.7.15 Soccer Committee, Division III Women's.

The Women's Soccer Committee shall consist of eight members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III women's soccer regions.

"21.10.7.16 Softball Committee, Division III Women's. The Women's Softball Committee shall consist of eight members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III softball regions.

"21.10.7.17 Swimming and Diving Committee, Division III Men's and Women's. The Men's and Women's Swimming and Diving Committee shall consist of the Division III representatives to the common Men's and Women's Swimming Committee with playing rules and championships administration responsibilities (see 21.5.5) and four additional members. Two of the additional members shall represent men's swimming interests and two shall represent women's swimming interests. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III swimming and diving regions.

"21.10.7.18 Tennis Committee, Division III Men's and Women's. The Men's and Women's Tennis Committee shall consist of eight members. Four members shall represent men's tennis interests and four shall represent women's tennis interests. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III tennis regions.

"21.10.7.19 Track and Field Committee, Division III Men's and Women's. The Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee shall consist of the Division III representatives to the common Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee with playing rules and championships administration responsibilities (see 21.5.6) and two additional members. One of the additional members shall represent men's track and field interests, and one shall represent women's track and field interests. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III track and field regions.

"21.10.7.19.1 Track and Field. The Men's and Women's Track and Field Committee shall be responsible for the Division III championships in cross country, indoor track and field, and outdoor track and field.

"21.10.7.20 Volleyball Committee, Division III Women's. The Division III Women's Volleyball Committee shall consist of eight members. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III women's volleyball regions.

"21.10.7.21 Wrestling Committee, Division III. The Wrestling Committee shall consist of the Division III representatives to the common Wrestling Committee with playing rules and championships administration

responsibilities (see 21.5.8) and one additional member. One member shall be elected from each of the Division III wrestling regions."

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to the NCAA Manual to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Transition Oversight Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In the restructured Association, all legislation (other than the Association's core principles) will be handled on a federated basis. Thus, changes to that legislation will be accomplished by each division acting independently. With this in mind, the Transition Oversight Committee focused on developing a committee structure that could effectively and efficiently function in this federated system. The group approached this assignment by asking, "What committee functions must continue to be handled by a single Association-wide entity?" rather than asking, "What current Association-wide committees should be federated?" The Transition Oversight Committee has recommended that only limited committee functions and responsibilities be maintained in the new structure under the charge of an Association-wide committee and with the oversight of the new Executive Committee. Each division will be responsible for appointing its Association-wide committee representatives consistent with each division's nomination and selection process. Every other committee function in the current structure will be handled by each division's new governance system. In situations where committee functions are not retained in an Association-wide capacity, division-specific committees will be encouraged to communicate with each other, or perhaps meet together. Accordingly, the opportunity for multiple-division dialogue on a topic of common interest will continue in the new structure.

Action: Parts A and C adopted (766-8-7). Parts B, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L and M adopted as amended by No. 28-2 (Division I: 290-5-2; Division II: 196-2-1; Division III: 261-1-0). Part N adopted as amended by No. 28-1 in Division I (300-7-7). Part O adopted in Division II (236-2-2). Part P adopted in Division III (296-2-0).

NO. 28-1 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — NCAA COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Intent: To specify that each Division I-A conference shall be represented by at least one person on each Division I cabinet.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 28-N, 21.8.6.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"21.8.6.1 General Requirements. Each of the Division I-A conferences listed in 4.2.1-(a) and 4.2.1-(b) shall have at least one representative on each of the cabinets. *The conferences listed in 4.2.1-(b)*

combined shall have at least one representative on each of the cabinets. Each of the conferences listed in 4-2-1-(c)-(1) and (2) shall have at least two representatives on the cabinets in the aggregate."

Source: All members of the Mid-American and Big West Conferences.

Rationale: The proposed cabinet structure calls for Division I-A to be assured 64 position, of which only four are assigned to and shared by the Mid-American and Big West Conferences. This amendment will guarantee both conferences one representative on each of the four cabinets while leaving the other eight Division I-A conferences an average of seven representatives to serve on cabinets. The amendment will not negatively impact any of the cabinet representational guarantees currently in place for any I-A, I-AA or I-AAA conference. Further, it will not alter the balance created in the cabinet structure between I-A, I-AA and I-AAA or the overall numerical allocation for each cabinet position. It simply will ensure that a previously unallocated at-large voting position in I-A will apply to the underrepresented conference consistent with the conference recognition developed throughout the NCAA governance structure.

Action: Adopted in Division I (187-72-69).

NO. 28-2 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — NCAA COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Intent: To clarify that Association-wide committees will include appropriate representation from all Division I subdivisions.

A. Bylaws: Amend 28-E, 21.3, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

[21.3 unchanged.]

21.3.1 Method of Selection and Operation. Each division's governance structure shall appoint members to serve on the general Association-wide committees of the Association, consistent with that division's committee-appointment procedures (see 21.8, 21.9 and 21.10). The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's membership divisions, **including each subdivision of Division I**. The Executive Committee shall ratify the appointment of all individuals serving on Association-wide committees and shall appoint the chairs of those committees. The Executive Committee also shall ratify policies regarding length, location and expenses of Association-wide committee meetings."

[Remainder of 21.3 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 28-G, 21.4, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

[21.4 unchanged.]

[21.4.1 unchanged.]

"21.4.1.1 Method of Selection. Each division's governance structure shall appoint members to serve on the rules committees without championships administration responsibilities, subject to the ratification of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also shall appoint the chair and secretary-rules editor of each committee. The secretary-rules editor may be re-elected without restriction and shall be a nonvoting member of the committee. The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's membership divisions, **including each subdivision of Division I in which a substantial number of schools sponsor the sport in question.**"

[Remainder of 21.4 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 28-I, 21.5, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

[21.5 unchanged.]

[21.5.1 unchanged.]

"21.5.1.1 Method of Selection. Each division's governance structure shall appoint members to serve on the committees with playing rules and championships administration responsibilities, subject to the ratification of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also shall appoint the chair and secretary-rules editor of each committee. The secretary-rules editor may be re-elected without restriction and shall be a nonvoting member of the committee. The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's membership divisions, **including each subdivision of Division I in which a substantial number of schools sponsor the sport in question.**"

[Remainder of 21.5 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 28-M, new 21.7, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

[21.7 unchanged.]

"21.7.1 Selection. Each applicable division's governance structure shall appoint members to serve on the common committees with governance administration responsibilities, subject to the ratification of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also shall appoint the chair. The membership of each committee shall include representatives from each of the Association's applicable membership divisions, **including each subdivision of Division I.**"

[Remainder of 21.7 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group and Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Rationale: This amendment will ensure that Division I subdivisions have an appropriate voice in discussions and decisions of committees that affect them, as has been specified at the Management Council, Board of Directors and Executive Committee levels.

Action: Adopted (Division I: 259-61-0; Division II: 138-8-5; Division III: 182-12-17).

NO. 29 (NO. 2-134) SPECIAL EVENTS COMMITTEE

Intent: To clarify the duties of the NCAA Special Events Committee as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.27, page 451, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"21.3.27 Special Events Committee

[21.3.27.1 unchanged.]

"21.3.27.2 Duties. The committee **members** shall be **jointly** responsible for issues involving postseason football contests and college all-star football and basketball contests and exempted contests. The Division I-A members shall *administer* **vote on Division I-A football matters and the Division I-AA members shall vote on Division I-AA football matters. All committee members shall participate in committee matters and meetings, regardless of voting rights.**"

Source: All members of the Southern Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: At the 1996 NCAA Convention, the Division I membership voted to expand the membership, duties and certification responsibilities of the Special Events Committee. This house-keeping legislation clarifies that the new I-AA members of the committee now have the responsibility to vote on I-AA football issues, but will not vote on I-A football issues. Further, the proposal ensures that committee members will participate in all committee matters either in a voting or nonvoting capacity.

Committee Position (Special Events Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The committee noted that representatives from all subdivisions were present during the discussion.

Action: Moot.

NO. 29-1 NCAA SPECIAL EVENTS COMMITTEE

Intent: To further clarify the duties of the NCAA Special Events Committee as specified.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 29, 21.3.27.2, as follows:

A-88

Legislative Proposals

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"21.3.27.2 Duties. The committee members shall be jointly responsible for the **review** of issues involving postseason football contests, *and* college all-star football and basketball contests, and exempted contests, **and for reporting its recommendations on such issues to the Division I Management Council and the Board of Directors for appropriate action.** The Division I-A members shall vote on Division I-A football matters and the Division I-AA members shall vote on Division I-AA football matters. All committee members shall participate in committee matters and meetings, regardless of voting rights."

Source: All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This amendment will further clarify that the Special Events Committee shall report its recommendations on issues related to postseason football contests, college all-star football and basketball contests, and exempted contests to the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors for appropriate action.

Action: Moot.

NO. 30 (NO. 2-135) STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Intent: To establish that the composition of the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee include at least one student-athlete from each sport in which the Association conducts a championship.

Bylaws: Amend 21.3.28, page 451, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"21.3.28 Student-Athlete Advisory Committee

"21.3.28.1 Composition. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee shall consist of 31 members, including 28 student-athletes, 12 from Division I, eight from Division II and eight from Division III, and including three members of the Council, one from each division. The composition of the committee shall be exempt from the playing-conference restriction set forth in Bylaw 21.1.1.2. The committee shall be constituted as follows:

"(a) **One student-athlete from each of the 22 sports in which the Association conducts championships for men and women with** *Nine 11 positions shall be allocated for male student-athletes, nine 11 positions shall be allocated for female student-athletes and 10 six student-athlete positions shall be unallocated;*"

[Remainder of 21.3.28 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Pacific West Conference, Fort Hays

Legislative Proposals

A-89

State University, Mesa State College and Western State College of Colorado.

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: The composition of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee should reflect equity in the representation of student-athletes in championship sports. The most qualified student-athletes to represent each sport are the student-athlete participants in their respective sports. For example, a basketball student-athlete may have difficulty understanding and, therefore, present unfair representation to another championship sport, such as rifle. Providing one representative from each championship sport an opportunity to participate on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee will ensure that all NCAA championship sports will have fair representation from the appropriate constituencies. The total number of members shall remain consistent with previous legislation of 31 members. The change reflects a more equal representation of female and male student-athletes in championship sports.

Committee Position (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee):
The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 31 (NO. 2-31) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I CABINETS/COMMITTEES

Intent: To establish limits on subdivisional representation in Division I Cabinets/Committees as specified.

Constitution: Amend 4.8 by adding new 4.8.1, page 38, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“4.8.1 Representation. With the exception of the Board of Directors, the Management Council and football-related committees, no subdivision of Division I shall have more than 50 percent representation on any committee/cabinet unless approved by a vote of at least 85 percent of the Board of Directors (or the Management Council if delegated such responsibility by the Board).”

Source: All members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Part of the restructuring commitment and discussion included super-majority representation of Division I-A on the Board of Directors and Management Council. This piece of legislation affirms this super majority as it relates to the composition of the Division I Board of Directors, Management Council and football-related committees and places limits on super majorities for all other cabinets/committees.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council oppose this proposal and, instead, support the Division I cabinet structure set forth in Proposal No. 28.

Action: Withdrawn in Division I.

NO. 32 (NO. 2-32) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I COMMITTEES

Intent: To establish limits on subdivisional representation on Division I committees as specified.

Constitution: Amend 4.8 by adding new 4.8.1, page 38, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“4.8.1 Representation. With the exception of the Board of Directors, the Management Council, the Cabinets (Championships, Strategic Planning, Business/Finance and Academics/Eligibility/Compliance) and football-related committees, no subdivision of Division I shall have more than 50 percent representation on any committee unless approved by a vote of at least 85 percent of the Board of Directors (or the Management Council if delegated such responsibility by the Board).”

Source: All members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Part of the restructuring commitment and discussion included super-majority representation of Division I-A on the Board of Directors, Management Council and Cabinets. This piece of legislation affirms this super majority and places limits on super majorities for all other committees.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council took no position on this proposal; however, the Board has taken the position that as a general rule the subdivision proportionality on the Management Council should be reflected in the composition of its subordinate bodies (i.e., cabinets and committees).

Action: Adopted in Division I (210-120-0).

NO. 32-1 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I COMMITTEES

Intent: To amend the effective date regarding the establishment of limits on subdivisional representation on Division I committees as specified.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 32, effective date, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"Effective Date: August 1, 1997, for all new committees; January 1, 1999, for all existing committees."

Source: All members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

Rationale: This amendment is not intended to alter the limits on super majorities for all new committees, but allows existing committees additional time to adjust to these limits.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 33 (NO. 2-30) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I CABINETS

Intent: To expand the pool of potential Division I Cabinet members as specified.

Constitution: Amend 4.8 by adding new 4.8.1, page 38, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.8.1 Composition — Division I Cabinet. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, the Division I Cabinets shall be comprised of athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior women administrators, assistant athletics directors, conference administrators), faculty athletics representatives and institutional administrators to whom athletics departments report or who have other significant duties regarding athletics."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Ivy Group, and Mid-Continent, Mid-Eastern Athletic and Midwestern Collegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This legislation is necessary to create as large a pool as possible of potential Division I Cabinet members, which will provide the highest quality of representation and increase opportunities to achieve diversity.

Action: Adopted in Division I (219-108-1).

NO. 34 (NO. 2-33) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I CABINETS

Intent: To provide in the constitution for minimum conference representation on Division I cabinets, including a minimum of two at any one time from each conference listed in 4.2.1-(c); to require the Management Council to develop and publish Division I cabinet seat rotations; to specify that conferences may appoint and remove their cabinet representatives; and to require the Management Council to review appointments for consistency with legislated requirements for positions and diversity.

A. Constitution: Amend 4.8 by adding new 4.8.1, page 38, as

A-92

Legislative Proposals

follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.8.1 Appointment of Cabinets — Conference Representation. Each of the Division I-A conferences listed in 4.2.1-(a) shall have at least one representative on each of the cabinets. The conferences listed in 4.2.1-(b) combined shall have at least one representative on each of the cabinets. Each of the conferences listed in 4.2.1-(c)-(1) and 4.2.1-(c)-(2) shall have at least two representatives on the cabinets in the aggregate."

"4.8.1.1 Conference Rotations. In consultation with all of the conferences listed in 4.2.1-(c)-(1) and 4.2.1-(c)-(2), the Management Council shall assure that there is a fair rotation among those conferences of representation on more than two cabinets at any one time, and that over any period of time there is a fair rotation of representation on each cabinet."

"4.8.1.1.1 Publication of Rotations. The Management Council shall maintain at all times a published plan for the rotations set forth in 4.8.1.1."

"4.8.1.1.2 Initial Rotation. In consultation with all of the conferences listed in 4.2.1-(c)-(1) and 4.2.1-(c)-(2), the Management Council shall establish staggered terms within the initial rotation of cabinet representation for such conferences, provided no initial term shall be for less than two years."

"4.8.1.2 Appointments."

"4.8.1.2.1 Appointments by Conferences. Subject to the provisions of this section, each conference shall appoint its cabinet representatives."

"4.8.1.2.2 Coordination of Appointments. The conferences represented in each subdivision of Division I (i.e., Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA, among the conferences identified in 4.2.1) shall review together within each subdivision the cabinet positions for which conferences in their subdivisions are eligible and shall coordinate the conferences appointments to those positions to assure consistency with the compositional requirements in 21.8.6.2, 21.8.6.3, 21.8.6.4 and 21.8.6.5, and with any diversity requirements which may be enacted in the constitution or by-laws."

"4.8.1.2.3 Review of Appointments. The Management Council shall review the appointments from each of the subdivisions and may direct any subdivision or conference to revise its appointments, if necessary, for consistency with the requirements noted in 4.8.1.3.2."

Legislative Proposals

A-93

"4.8.1.3 Appointment of Chairs. The Management Council shall select the chair of each cabinet.

"4.8.1.4 Removal of a Conference's Representative. Any conference listed in 4.2.1 shall have the authority to remove any of its cabinet representatives at any time.

"4.8.1.5 Appointment to Fill Vacancies. Any conference listed in 4.2.1 shall have the authority to fill any vacancy that may occur in its representation, provided the Management Council may direct the conference to revise its appointment, if necessary, for consistency with the requirements noted in 4.8.1.2.2."

[Note: If adopted, this provision will be division-dominant and may be amended only by at least a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting at a Division I annual or special Convention.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group and Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Consistent with the process for selection to the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council, Division I conferences should be permitted to select and remove their representatives to the cabinets under the new governance structure. Constitutionally guaranteeing minimum conference appointments and a conference rotation will provide a truly representative governance substructure, and conference appointments are the best way to assure knowledgeable and effective appointees. Management Council review is provided for consistency with all legislated positional diversity requirements.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and Transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division I (296-14-3).

NO. 35 (NO. 2-39) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Intent: To specify that Division I legislation may be sponsored and, thus, the full legislative process initiated, by any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.2.1 by adding new 5.3.2.1.1, page 57, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.2.1.1 Regular or Alternate Member. Any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council may sponsor a legislative amend-

ment applicable to Division I."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Ivy Group, and Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Eastern Athletic and Midwestern Collegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Under the conference-based representative system, each conference's representative should be able to initiate the full legislative process.

Action: Adopted as amended by Nos. 35-1 and 35-2 in Division I (277-16-0).

NO. 35-1 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Intent: To specify that Division I legislation may be sponsored for both the regular legislative process and any legislative Convention by any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors of Management Council.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 35, 5.3.2.1.1, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.2.1.1 Regular or Alternate Member. Any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council may sponsor a legislative amendment applicable to Division I for both the regular legislative process and for any legislative Convention."

Source: All members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

Rationale: Under the conference-based representative system, each conference's representative should be able to sponsor legislation for both the full legislative process and for any legislative Convention.

Action: Adopted in Division I (260-56-1).

NO. 35-2 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Intent: To specify that any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council may move that current or proposed Division I policies and procedures become legislative proposals, thus, subject to the override process.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 35-2, 5.3.2.1.1, as follows:
[Division I only]

"5.3.2.1.1 Regular or Alternate Member. Any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council may sponsor a legislative amendment applicable to Division I. A member also may move that current or proposed Division I policies and procedures become legisla-

tive proposals, subject to the override process.”

Source: Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference

Rationale: At the October 1996 NCAA Council meeting, it was noted for the record that subdivisional policies and procedures are not subject to the override process because they are not legislative in nature. It was suggested that a clarification be offered to Proposal No. 35 to note that any member of the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council may move that such policies and procedures become legislative proposals, to be included as administrative regulations in the NCAA Manual and, thus, subject to the override process.

Action: Adopted in Division I (253-56-8).

NO. 36 (NO. 2-41) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Intent: To clarify that the Division I membership may override the Division I Management Council’s failure to act on legislative proposals in legislative areas delegated to it by the Division I Board of Directors.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.2.3, page 58, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“5.3.2.3 Membership “Override” of Legislative Changes. The member institutions of Division I may override (e.g., rescind) the adoption of legislation enacted under the procedures set forth in 5.3.2.2.2 or the failure of the Board of Directors, or of the **Division I Management Council in legislative areas delegated to it by the Board**, to act on or adopt legislation initiated and considered through the legislative process.”

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Ivy Group, and Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Eastern Athletic and Midwestern Collegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Although the “override” provisions are intended to provide review of final decisions by the Management Council and Board of Directors not to adopt proposed legislation, the current legislation does not provide for such review of Management Council decisions. This legislation would permit the membership to request Board review of such decisions, followed by an override vote as an appropriate review process. With much initial legislative authority delegated to the Management Council, this provision is necessary to ensure membership review of all final legislative action, positive or negative, as the original override proposal contemplated.

Action: Adopted in Division I (302-1-0).

NO. 37 (NO. 2-35) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — SPECIAL CONVENTION

Intent: To revise the Division I membership structure to specify that a special Division I legislative Convention may be called by the Executive Committee, the Division I Board of Directors or by petition of at least 100 active member institutions.

Constitution: Amend 5.1.1 by adding new 5.1.1.3, page 44, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“5.1.1.3 **Special Division I Legislative Convention.** A special Division I legislative Convention of the Association may be called by the Executive Committee, the Division I Board of Directors or by petition of at least 100 active Division I member institutions with voting privileges. Such petition shall be initiated by a member institution or a member conference acting on behalf of its institutions. Any petition submitted by a member institution must be signed by that institution’s chief executive officer or the chief executive officer’s designated representative. Any petition submitted by a member conference on behalf of its institutions must be signed by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference and the chair of the conference’s presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference’s member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group. Any special Division I legislative Convention shall be scheduled at the Association’s annual Convention unless specifically noted otherwise in the petition.”

Source: All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Midwestern Collegiate and Southern Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal would permit the specified number of institutions, in addition to the Executive Committee, to call a special Convention. It is not intended by the sponsors that these Conventions be routinely scheduled; rather, it does provide the Division I membership a “fail-safe” opportunity to request a legislative Convention if desired by a significant percentage of the Division I membership.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and the transition Management Council took no position on this proposal. The bodies agreed to support Proposal Nos. 35 and 36 with the understanding that this proposal would be withdrawn by its sponsors if those two amendments are adopted.

Action: Withdrawn in Division I.

NO. 38 (NO. 2-36) **NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— ESTABLISHMENT OF CONVENTION
PROGRAM**

Intent: To permit the Association's membership to establish program agenda items for an annual or special Convention, and the Division I membership to establish program agenda items for a special Division I legislative Convention as specified. Further, to authorize a legislative process for the sponsorship and submission of Division I proposals or resolutions at such Conventions.

A. Constitution: Amend 5.1.2.1, page 45, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.1.2.1 Establishment of Program — Annual or Special Convention. The program of the business session of an annual or special Convention of the Association shall be established by the Executive Committee, acting as the Convention program committee, **or by petition of at least 100 active Association members with voting privileges, filed either directly or by a conference acting on behalf of its member institutions. Any petition submitted by a member institution must be signed by that institution's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative. Any petition submitted by a member conference on behalf of its institutions must be signed by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference and the chair of the conference's presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group."**

B. Constitution: Amend 5.1.2 by adding new 5.1.2.2, page 45, as follows

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.1.2.2 Establishment of Program — Special Division I Legislative Convention. The program of the business session of a special Division I legislative Convention shall be established by the Executive Committee, the Division I Board of Directors, acting as a Convention program committee, **or by petition of at least 100 active Division I member institutions with voting privileges, filed directly or by a conference acting on behalf of its member institutions. Any petition submitted by a member institution must be signed by that institution's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative. Any petition submitted by a member conference on behalf of its institutions must be signed by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference and the chair of the conference's presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no**

presidential administrative group."

C. Constitution: Amend 5.3.1.1, page 52, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.3.1.1 Amendment. The dominant provisions of Constitution 1 and 2 and elsewhere and the division dominant provisions may be amended only at an annual or special Convention. In Division I, federated provisions may be amended as specified in 5.3.2 **or at an annual or special Convention.** In Divisions II and III, federated provisions may be amended at any annual or special Convention.

D. Constitution: Amend 5.3.1.4, pages 52-53, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.1.4 Amendment-to-Amendment—Federated Provisions. A proposed amendment to a federated provision of the bylaws in Divisions I, II or III may be amended at any annual or special Convention. From July 15 through September 15, sponsors of proposed legislation may refine and change proposals in any manner that is germane to the original proposal. After September 15, proposed amendments may be amended only in the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the provision to be amended."

E. Constitution: Amend 5.3.1, by adding new 5.3.1.5, pages 52-53, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.1.5 Division I Legislative Process—Annual or Special Convention. If an annual or special Convention or Division I legislative Convention is established by the NCAA Executive Committee or the Division I Board of Directors, any proposed amendment, amendment to amendment or resolution related to a Division I federated provision shall be subject to the sponsorship and submission requirements used by the Division I membership prior to August 1, 1997."

Source: All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Midwestern Collegiate and Southern Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The Association's membership, in addition to the Executive Committee, should have the authority to establish the program of the business sessions of an annual or special Convention, and the Division I membership, in addition to the Executive Committee, should have the authority to establish the program of the business session of a Division I legislative Convention. Further, if such a Convention is established, any amendments-to-amendments or resolutions related to a Division I federated provision shall be subject to the sponsorship and submission requirements used by the Division I membership prior to August 1, 1997.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council and the Divisions II and III Presidents Council and Management Council transition teams): The Division I transition Board of Directors and the transition Management Council took no position on this proposal. The bodies agreed to support Proposal Nos. 35 and 36 with the understanding that this proposal would be withdrawn by its sponsors if those two amendments are adopted. The Division II Presidents Council and Management Council transition teams oppose Section A of this Proposal. The Division III Presidents Council and Management Council transition teams took no position on this proposal.

Action: Parts A and C defeated (344-375-43). Parts B, D and E defeated in Division I (67-221-3).

**NO. 39 (NO. 2-38) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— VOTING METHODS**

Intent: To clarify that voting at any type of NCAA Convention under the revised membership structure shall be based on the current Convention system of one institution, one vote, for member institutions and conferences.

A. Constitution: Amend 5.1.4.4, pages 48-49, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

“5.1.4.4 Voting Methods — Annual or Special Convention. The methods of voting at an NCAA annual or special Convention shall be by voice, paddle, roll call and/or secret ballot, in accordance with the following procedures: **In all cases, votes shall be based on a system of one institution, one vote for member institutions and conferences.”**

[Remainder of 5.1.4.4 unchanged.]

B. Constitution: Amend 5.1.4.4 by adding new 5.1.4.4.1, page 49, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“5.1.4.4.1 Voting Methods — Division I Legislative Convention. The methods of voting at a special Division I legislative Convention shall be by voice, paddle, roll call and/or secret ballot, in accordance with the procedures set forth in 5.1.4.4.”

Source: All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Midwestern Collegiate and Southern Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Some confusion exists over whether the current Convention voting system of one institution, one vote continues under the revised membership structure in those instances where the Association's leadership or membership or the Division I leadership or membership calls a Convention. This legislation is intended to reinforce that this voting method will be used at fu-

ture Conventions.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council and the Divisions II and III Presidents Council transition teams): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council took no position on this proposal. The bodies agreed to support Proposal Nos. 35 and 36 with the understanding that this proposal would be withdrawn by its sponsors if those two amendments are adopted. The Division II Presidents Council and Management Council transition teams took no position on this proposal. The Division III Presidents Council and Management Council transition teams took no position on this proposal.

Action: Part A withdrawn. Part B withdrawn in Division I.

**NO. 40 (NO. 2-44) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE PROCESS**

Intent: To specify that Division I legislation may be introduced, and the full legislative process thus initiated, by any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.4, page 59, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“5.3.4 Sponsorship — Amendments to Division Dominant Provisions

“5.3.4.1 Amendment. An amendment to a division dominant provision may be sponsored by the appropriate divisional presidential administrative group **or, in Division I, introduced by any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors.**

“5.3.4.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. An amendment-to-amendment to a division dominant provision may be sponsored by the appropriate divisional presidential administrative group **or, in Division I, introduced by any one regular or alternate member of the Division I Board of Directors.”**

[5.3.4.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Ivy Group, and Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Eastern Athletic and Midwestern Collegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Under the conference-based representative system, each conference's representative on the Division I Board of Directors should be able to initiate the full legislative process.

Action: Adopted in Division I (317-2-0).

**NO. 41 (NO. 2-43) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE PROCESS**

Intent: To clarify that the membership override of legislative action

Legislative Proposals

taken by the Division I Board of Directors (or Management Council in areas delegated to it) shall be based on the principle of one institution, one vote, and that override votes shall be roll call votes.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.2.3.3, page 58, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.2.3.3 Five-Eighths Majority Vote. At least a five-eighths majority vote of the active Division I members present and voting shall be required to override the legislative action taken by the Board of Directors (or by the Management Council in an area delegated to it). **The vote shall be based on the principle of one institution, one vote and all override votes shall be taken with recorded roll calls.**"

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic and Midwestern Collegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Override votes by the Division I membership of legislative actions taken by the Board of Directors (or Management Council in areas delegated to it) should be based on the principle of one institution, one vote and should be a recorded roll call vote.

Action: Adopted in Division I (318-1-1).

***NO. 42 (NO. 2-23) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I-AA GOVERNANCE
STRUCTURE**

Intent: To establish a Division I-AA governance committee of the Division I Management Council to act on legislative issues specific to I-AA football.

Constitution: Amend 4.5 by adding new 4.5.5, page 36, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.5 Division I-AA Governance Committee. A Division I-AA Governance Committee of the Division I Management Council shall have the authority to act on behalf of the Division I-AA members of the Management Council on legislative issues specific to Division I-AA football in accordance with 5.3.2.2.3 (see 5.1.4.3.2).

"4.5.5.1 Composition. The Division I-AA Governance Committee shall consist of the following:

"(a) The members of the Division I Management Council from the conferences listed in 4.5.1-(c)-(1);

"(b) A representative selected by the conference from each conference listed in 4.5.1-(c)-(1) that does not have a representative on the Division I Management Council; and

"(c) A representative selected by the conference from

each conference that conducts a Division I-AA football championship but is not listed in 4.5.1-(c)-(1), provided:

"(1) The conference consists of at least six Division I-AA football-playing members (regular or affiliate members) that play a single round-robin schedule that leads to the declaration of a conference football champion; and

"(2) The affairs of the conference are administered by a conference listed in 4.5.1-(a), 4.5.1-(b) or 4.5.1-(c).

"4.5.5.2 Meetings. The Division I-AA Governance Committee shall meet prior to each Division I Management Council meeting and at a special meeting upon the call of the chair. The chair shall be required to call a special meeting upon request by two-thirds of the committee member.

"4.5.5.3 Administration. The administration and actions of the Division I-AA Governance Committee shall be governed by Division I Management Council policy and procedure, and by the provisions of 4.5.3 (selection/term of office) and 4.5.4 (voting method)."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division I-AA Football Issue Subcommittee of the transition Management Council).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Division I-AA conference representatives on the transition management team expressed concern about the need to involve Division I-AA institutions in the resolution of Division I-AA football issues. It was noted that a number of Division I-AA football-playing institutions compete in conferences that are not represented in the governance structure because they are not multisport conferences. This proposal provides an opportunity for each Division I-AA conference that conducts a football championship to be involved in the representative structure that makes decisions regarding Division I-AA football if the conference meets the specific criteria. The committee's authority will be limited to football issues.

Action: Adopted in Division I (315-2-4).

**NO. 43 (NO. 2-37) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I-AA GOVERNANCE
STRUCTURE**

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To establish a parallel representative governance structure

within Division I to consider Division I-AA football issues.

Constitution: Amend 5.1.4.3.5.2, page 48, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.1.4.3.5.2 Divisions I-A and I-AA Football. Members of Division I-A and Division I-AA shall vote separately in their respective subdivisions on legislative issues that pertain only to that sport. **Legislation pertaining to Division I-AA football shall be voted on by a governance structure composed of one representative per conference that participates in Division I-AA football in accordance with the following criteria:**

"(a) The conference shall have membership of at least six Division I-AA football institutions; and

"(b) The conference shall declare a conference champion through competition on the field."

Source: Butler University, Drake University, University of Evansville, Illinois State University, Indiana State University, University of Northern Iowa, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Southwest Missouri State University, Valparaiso University and Western Illinois University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The new NCAA structure does not provide adequate representation for Division I-AA because over one-third of Division I-AA institutions are unrepresented by voice or vote through an "all-sports" conference. Further, because "all-sports" conferences are represented on either the Board of Directors or the Management Council but not both, at any given time, some Division I-AA conferences are without voice and vote at the Management Council level where it is anticipated that most legislative issues will be discussed and formulated. This legislation has no effect on the new NCAA structure for matters that are unrelated to Division I-AA football.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council oppose this proposal and, instead, support Proposal No. 42.

Action: Moot in Division I.

NO. 44 (NO. 2-42) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Intent: To establish an override provision specific to legislation affecting Division I-AA football.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.2.3 by adding new 5.3.2.3.1.1, page 58, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.2.3.1.1 Call For an Override Vote in Division I-AA Football-Only Issues. In order to call for a vote to override the adoption of a football-related only legislative change or the failure of a football-related only legislative change in Division I-AA, written requests for such a vote from at least 15 active Division I-AA member institutions with voting privileges must be received in the national office by 5 p.m. Central time 60 days after the official publication to the membership of the legislative action. In addition, conferences may file such requests for an override vote on behalf of their member institutions. To take such action, a conference must annually submit to the Division I Board of Directors its procedures to ensure that chief executive officers have delegated this authority. The override vote request must be signed by the institution's chief executive officer, the chief executive officer's designated representative, or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group. Upon receipt of 40 requests for an override vote, the affected legislation will be suspended until final action (e.g., vote) is taken by the Division I-AA membership."

Source: All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic and Southern Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Division I-AA members should have the opportunity to override legislative changes enacted by the Board of Directors or the failure of the Board of Directors to act on or adopt legislation initiated and considered through the legislative process that is specific to Division I-AA football.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division I (296-5-16).

NO. 45 (NO. 2-40) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I-AA FINANCIAL AID AWARDS

Intent: To require a vote of two-thirds majority of I-AA conferences represented on both the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council to modify the permissible number of football grants-in-aid for I-AA institutions.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.2.2.3 by adding new 5.3.2.2.3.2, page 58, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.2.2.3.2 Modification of Permissible Grants-In-Aid — Division I-AA Football. Any amendment to modify the permissible number of football grants-in-aid for Division I-AA institutions shall require a vote of two-thirds majority of the Division I-AA conferences represented on both the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council."

Source: All members of the Southern and Southland Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The athletically related financial aid commitments of Division I-AA institutions have historically demonstrated a unique diversity. With the diverse commitments to scholarship levels, the subdivision has thrived, growing to represent the largest number of institutions within Division I. Any future revisions, either increasing or decreasing financial aid limitations for the subdivision, should reflect the agreement of a broad spectrum of Division I-AA members, including the so-called nonscholarship, low-scholarship and maximum-scholarship programs. Requiring a two-thirds majority to support any such change would guarantee that the various Division I-AA interests are able to agree on an appropriate maximum level of athletically related financial aid.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council took no position on this proposal.

Action: Withdrawn in Division I.

***NO. 46 (NO. 2-46) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — DIVISION I INTERPRETATIVE PROCESS**

Intent: To clarify the Division I interpretative process in the revised membership structure as specified.

Constitution: Amend 5.4.1.2, pages 68-69, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"5.4.1.2 Interpretation Process

"5.4.1.2.1 Response to Request. The legislative services staff shall respond to a request from a member institution for an interpretation of NCAA rules. Such an interpretation is binding on the institution unless it is modified by the *Interpretations Committee* **Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet.**

"5.4.1.2.2 Review of Staff Interpretation. A member institution may request a review by the *Interpretations Committee* **Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet (or a subcommittee designated by it)** of any interpretation provided by the legislative services staff. Such a request must be submitted in writing by the institution's conference or by one of the

five individuals who are authorized to request such interpretations on behalf of the institution [i.e., chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative, athletics director, senior woman administrator, compliance coordinator, or designated substitute(s) for the chief executive officer and/or athletics director, as specified in writing to the national office].

"5.4.1.2.3 Review of Interpretations Committee Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet's Decision. The *divisional presidential administrative groups or mManagement cCouncils* per 4.2 through 4.7 shall review all interpretations issued by the *Interpretations Committee Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet (or the subcommittee designated by it)* and may approve, reverse or modify such interpretations. A member institution may appeal a decision of the *Interpretations Committee Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet (or the subcommittee designated by it)* to the *presidential administrative group or mManagement cCouncil at the Management Council* meeting immediately following the decision of the *committee cabinet*. The appeal must be submitted in writing by the institution's chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative or director of athletics. The *presidential administrative group and mManagement cCouncil* shall establish the procedures for such an appeal. **A decision of the Management Council is final and no additional appeal opportunity shall exist for a member institution.**

"5.4.1.2.4 Publication or Notification. Interpretations issued by a *divisional presidential administrative group, a management council or the Interpretations Committee* **the Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet** shall be binding upon notification to affected institutions and upon all member institutions after publication and circulation to the membership.

"5.4.1.2.5 Revision. Interpretations approved by a *divisional administrative group or the mManagement cCouncil* may not be revised by the *Interpretations Committee Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet (or the subcommittee designated by it)*. The *Interpretations Committee Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet (or the subcommittee designated by it)* may only recommend to the *divisional presidential administrative groups or mManagement cCouncils* revisions of such interpretations."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The Division I transition Management Council and Board of Directors reviewed the current process for interpreting legislation affecting Division I member institutions. This proposal modifies the current process to conform to the new structure. It does not represent a significant change in the process. The

proposal permits reviews by the Academic/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet and appeals to the Management Council and provides final interpretive authority on Division I legislation to the Management Council. However, it should be noted that the Board of Directors retains ultimate supervisory authority through its general power to "ratify, amend or rescind the actions of the Division I Management Council."

Action: Adopted in Division I (321-1-3).

**NO. 47 (NO. 2-7) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I REVENUE GUARANTEE**

Intent: To specify that with any joint venture between the Association (or the Association's representative or agent) and a Division I member conference or a Division I member institution (or a representative or agent of a Division I member institution or conference) all NCAA revenue occurring from such ventures shall flow through the Association in a manner that is consistent with previously agreed upon financial guarantees to the Division I membership.

[Note: Part B of this proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

- A. Constitution:** Amend 4.01.2.2 by adding new 4.01.2.2.3, pages 21-22, as follows:

[Division Dominant, Division I only, roll call]

"4.01.2.2.3 Joint Ventures. Within Division I, all marketing joint ventures between the Association (or the representative or agent of a Division I member institution or conference) shall be reviewed by an NCAA Division I Marketing Committee."

"4.01.2.2.3.1 Definition. A marketing joint venture is any marketing program, agreement or contract that uses the Association's marks or logos in conjunction with those of a Division I conference or member institution."

"4.01.2.2.3.2 Approval Process. Any joint venture defined in Bylaw 4.01.2.2.3.1 shall require the approval of the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors to be enacted as an Association business operation."

- B. Bylaws:** Amend new 21.8.6.5 by adding new 21.8.6.5.3, page 458, to create a Division I Committee on Marketing, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"21.8.6.5.3.1 Marketing, Division I Committee on

"21.8.6.5.4.1.1 Composition. The Division I Marketing Committee shall consist of 12 members, six of whom shall represent Division I-A institutions, three of whom shall represent Division I-AA institutions, and

three of whom shall represent I-AAA institutions.

"21.8.6.5.3.1.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for oversight, policy recommendations and approval for all of the Association's Division I related marketing programs including, but not limited to, the NCAA Corporate Partners program, all licensing agreements, all promotional activities, and any joint marketing ventures, subject to final review by the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors."

Source: All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal will ensure that financial resources of the Association are not used in joint ventures with Division I members conferences or member institutions unless such marketing ventures are approved by a new Division I Marketing Committee. Approval of joint ventures by the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors also will ensure that these actions fall under the membership's override vote protection.

Committee Position (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council): The Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council took no position on this proposal).

Action: Part A as amended by Nos. 47-1-A and 47-2 adopted in Division I (278-41-0). Part B moot in Division I.

**NO. 47-1 NCAA MEMBERSHIP
RESTRUCTURING—DIVISION I
REVENUE GUARANTEE**

Intent: To clarify the definition of a marketing joint venture and to specify that all marketing joint ventures between the Association (or the Association's representative or agent) and a Division I member conference or a Division I member institution (or a representative or agent of a Division I member institution or conference) shall be reviewed by the Division I Business/Finance Cabinet).

- A. Constitution:** Amend Proposal No. 47-A, new 4.01.2.2.3 as follows:

[Division Dominant, Division I only, roll call]

"4.01.2.2.3 Joint Ventures. Within Division I, all marketing joint ventures between the Association (or the representative or agent of a Division I member institution or conference) shall be reviewed by an NCAA Division I Marketing Committee the Division I Business/Finance Cabinet."

"4.01.2.2.3.1 Definition. A marketing joint venture is any marketing program, agreement or contract that uses the As-

sociation's marks or logos in conjunction with those of a Division I conference or member institution.

"4.01.2.2.3.2 Approval Process. **The principles and overall program of Aany joint venture defined in Bylaw 4.01.2.2.3.1 shall require the approval of the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors to be enacted as an Association business operation.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 47-B, new 21.8.6.5.3, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"21.8.6.5.3.1 *Marketing, Division I Committee on*

"21.8.6.5.4.1.1 *Composition. The Division I Marketing Committee shall consist of 12 members, six of whom shall represent Division I-A institutions, three of whom shall represent Division I-AA institutions, and three of whom shall represent I-AAA institutions.*

"21.8.6.5.3.1.2 *Duties. The committee shall be responsible for oversight, policy recommendations and approval for all of the Association's Division I related marketing programs including, but not limited to, the NCAA Corporate Partners program, all licensing agreements, all promotional activities, and any joint marketing ventures, subject to final review by the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors.*"

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This amendment will eliminate the need for a Division I Committee on Marketing and clarifies that marketing joint ventures between the Association and Division I member conferences or Division I member institutions shall be reviewed by the Division I Business/Finance Cabinet.

Action: Part A adopted in Division I (311-11-2). Part B adopted in Division I (312-9-1).

NO. 47-2 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING— DIVISION I REVENUE GUARANTEE

Intent: To clarify that the requirement that all marketing joint ventures between the Association (or the Association's representative or agent) and a Division I member conference or a Division I member institution (or a representative or agent of a Division I institution or conference) is applicable to all sports (other than Division I-A football) in which the Association sponsored a championship as of January 15, 1997.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal 47-A, new 4.01.2.2.3, as follows:

[Division Dominant, Division I only, roll call]

"4.01.2.2.3 *Joint Ventures. Within Division I, all marketing joint ventures, involving sports (other than Division I-A football) in which the NCAA sponsored a championship as of*

January 15, 1997, between the Association (or the representative or agent of a Division I member institution or conference) shall be reviewed by an NCAA Division I Marketing Committee."

[Remainder of 4.01.2.2.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Rationale: This amendment to Proposal No. 47-A simply clarifies that the review process for marketing joint ventures between the Association and Division I member conferences or Division I member institutions is applicable to all sports (other than Division I-A football) in which the Association currently sponsors championships.

Action: Adopted in Division I (308-13-2).

***NO. 48 (NO. 2-6) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING — WAIVER OF DIVISION I REVENUE GUARANTEE**

Intent: To permit the Division I Board of Directors to waive the proportionality requirements of the Division I revenue guarantees in regard to the Academic Enhancement, Conference Grant and/or Special Assistance funds.

Constitution: Amend 4.01.2.2 by adding new 4.01.2.2.2.3, pages 21-22, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"4.01.2.2.2.3 **Waiver of Proportionality Requirement. The Division I Board of Directors may waive the proportionality requirements of the revenue guarantee to permit uniform increases to all Division I programs in the Academic Enhancement, Conference Grant and Special Assistance funds.**"

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division I transition Board of Directors and transition Management Council).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The transition Management Council and transition Board of Directors agreed that the revenue guarantees adopted as a part of the Division I restructuring legislation did not provide sufficient flexibility for the development of future budgets. This proposal is intended to address the flexibility concern as it relates specifically to the academic enhancement, conference grant and special assistance funds, which are generally distributed more evenly to Division I members. The proposal would allow for increases in those funds on a uniform basis for all Division I programs without strictly adhering to the guarantee of proportionality among all of the funds distributed to Division I. The Board of Directors could elect to waive the proportionality requirements for this purpose when it believes circumstances

warrant.

Action: Adopted in Division I (319-4-1).

**NO. 49 (NO. 2-8) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS**

Intent: To affirm that not more than one national championship shall be conducted in each men's and women's Division I sport except football.

Constitution: Amend 4.01.2.3 by adding new 4.01.2.3.2, page 22, as follows:

[Division dominant/Division I only, roll call]

"4.01.2.3.2 Championships — Sports Other Than Football. With the exception of Division I football, not more than one national championship shall be conducted in each men's and women's Division I sport."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal codifies the commitment made during the discussions related to the revised membership structure that national championships would be retained in their present form. The sponsors believe this proposal to be noncontroversial in nature.

Action: Adopted in Division I (322-1-0).

***NO. 50 (NO. 2-130) NCAA MEMBERSHIP
RESTRUCTURING — NATIONAL
COLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIPS**

Intent: To create procedures for the establishment of a National Collegiate Championship in the revised membership structure.

Bylaws: Amend 18.2.1, page 396, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"18.2.1 National Collegiate Championship. A National Collegiate Championship for which any active member in good standing is eligible (per 20.8) may be established by majority vote action of all members present and voting at an annual Convention three divisions acting through each division's governance structure subject to the requirements, standards and conditions regarding the required number of members sponsoring the sport as prescribed in this bylaw."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Transition Oversight Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal will provide for the establishment of a National Collegiate Championship in the new NCAA structure. Each division, acting through its governance structure, will be able to approve the establishment of such a championship. Consistent with current practice, Division I will continue to administer these championships. Minimum sponsorship criteria necessary to establish a championship remain unchanged.

Action: Adopted (777-6-2).

***NO. 51 (NO. 2-45) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING
— DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROCESS**

Intent: To amend the effective date of the new legislative sponsorship requirements in Division II from August 1, 1997, to immediately.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.5, pages 59-60, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"5.3.5 Sponsorship — Amendments to Divisions II and III Legislation

"5.3.5.1 Amendment. An amendment to a provision of the bylaws may be sponsored by:

"(a) The Division II or III Presidents Council;

"(b) Fifteen or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division II and eight or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division III, upon written verification of sponsorship signed by each sponsoring member's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative;

"(c) At least two member conferences with voting privileges in Division II when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conferences on behalf of 15 or more of their active member institutions and signed by the chairs of the conferences' official presidential administrative groups or at least two chief executive officers of a conference's member institutions if a conference has no presidential administrative group; or

"(d) A member conference with voting privileges in Division III, when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference on behalf of eight or more of the active member institutions and signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group.

"5.3.5.1.1 Amendment, Federated Provision. When legislation is applicable only to a particular division, only members of that division may submit amendments to that legislation.

"5.3.5.1.2 Primary Contact Person. All amendments to the

constitution and bylaws proposed by member institutions and member conferences shall designate a primary contact person.

"5.3.5.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. An amendment to an amendment of a provision of the bylaws may be sponsored by:

"(a) The Division II or III Presidents Council;

"(b) Fifteen or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division II and eight or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division III, when submitted in writing by each institution's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative;

"(c) At least two member conferences with voting privileges in Division II, when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conferences on behalf of 15 or more of their active member institutions and signed by the chairs of the conferences' official presidential administrative groups or at least two chief executive officers of a conference's member institutions if a conference has no presidential administrative group; or

"(d) A member conference with voting privileges in Division III, when submitted in writing by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference on behalf of eight or more of its active member institutions and signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group.

"5.3.5.2.1 Primary Contact Person. All amendments-to-amendments to the constitution and bylaws proposed by member institutions and member conferences shall designate a primary contact person.

"5.3.5.3 Editorial Changes. The presiding officer may permit changes in the wording of proposed amendments of a purely editorial nature or to correct typographical errors."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997 **Immediately.***

Rationale: The Division II membership revised the Division II legislative sponsorship requirements by adopting 1996 Convention Proposal No. 7. This change requires at least 15 institutions or two conferences to sponsor a Division II legislative proposal. The August 1, 1997, effective date is two weeks later than the division's legislative sponsorship deadline of July 15, 1997, for the 1998 Convention. Changing the effective date to immediately will allow the new sponsorship requirements established by Proposal No. 7 to apply to legislation sponsored for the 1998 Convention.

Action: Adopted in Division II (233-2-2).

***NO. 52 (NO. 2-133) DIVISION II MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT**

Intent: To revise the Division II philosophy statement as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.10, pages 430-431, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"20.10 DIVISION II MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS "DIVISION II PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

"In addition to the purposes and fundamental policy of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, as set forth in Constitution 1, members of Division II believe that a well-conducted intercollegiate athletics program, based on sound educational principles and practices, is a proper part of the educational mission of a university or college and that the educational welfare of the participating student-athlete is of primary concern.

"Members of Division II support the following principles in the belief that these objectives assist in defining the division and the possible differences between it and other divisions of the Association. This statement *is not binding on member institutions but shall serve as a guide for the preparation of legislation by the division and for planning and implementation of programs by institutions and conferences.* A member of Division II:

"(a) Believes in offering *a maximum amount of* intercollegiate athletics participation to as many of its students as possible, whether or not these students are athletically recruited or financially assisted;

"(b) Believes in striving for **broad equitable** participation and competitive excellence, encouraging sportsmanship **and ethical conduct**, and developing positive societal attitudes in all of its athletics endeavors;

"(c) Believes in scheduling the majority of its athletics competition with other members of Division II, insofar as **regional qualification**, geographical location and traditional or conference scheduling patterns permit;

[20.10-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Believes in **offering opportunity for participation in intercollegiate athletics** by permitting athletically related financial aid for its student-athletes *but on a more modest basis than that permitted in Division I; and*

"(f) Believes that all members of Division II, *including those institutions aspiring to membership in some other division or those unable to subscribe to all of the aspects of the Division II philosophy, should commit themselves to that **this** philosophy and to the regulations and programs of Division II.*"

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division II Presidents Council and Management Council Transition Teams).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This revised philosophy statement better reflects the philosophy of the Association's Division II institutions regarding their role in intercollegiate athletics. This statement is consistent with the changes approved by the Division II membership in 1996 Convention Proposal No. 7 (membership restructuring).

Action: Adopted in Division II (234-3-42).

NO. 53 (NO. 2-132) MEMBERSHIP RECLASSIFICATION — NOTIFICATION AND CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Intent: To establish a two-year notification requirement for institutions that intend to reclassify a sport from Division II to Division I and to exclude those institutions that have forwarded such notice to the national office from eligibility for any Division II NCAA championship in that sport.

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.4.2 by adding new 20.4.2.2, page 417, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"20.4.2.2 Classification of a Sport from Division II to Division I — Notification Requirement. The chief executive officer of a Division II member that intends to petition for multidivision classification pursuant to 20.4.1.2 shall submit to the Association's executive director written notice of the institution's intention to reclassify the sport. The notice shall be received in the national office (by mail or wired transmission) not later than June 1 two years prior to the September 1 when the institution intends to reclassify the sport to Division I."

[20.4.2.2 and 20.4.2.3 renumbered as 20.4.2.3 and 20.4.2.4, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.4.3 by adding new 20.4.3.1, page 418, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"20.4.3.1 Reclassification of a Sport from Division II to Division I. A member of Division II that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification in one sport to Division I per 20.4.2.2 no longer shall be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championship in that sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: At the 1994 NCAA Convention, the Division II membership adopted legislation that requires a Division II institution to submit written notice to the NCAA national office not later than June 1 two years prior to the September 1 when the institution intends to reclassify to Division I. In addition, at the time the Division II institution forwards to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership reclassification to Division I, the institution no longer is eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championships. The Division II membership was attempting to address concerns regarding the competitive advantage obtained by Division II institutions while preparing to reclassify to Division I. Such institutions remained eligible for Division II championships even though they were recruiting with the promise of being Division I members within two years and expending the necessary funds to increase staff size to operate at a higher level to prepare for Division I competition. This proposal will "level the playing field" by placing the same requirements and restrictions on a Division II institution that is petitioning for multidivision reclassification that currently apply to a Division II institution that is petitioning for reclassification of its entire program.

Action: Adopted in Division II (227-9-3).

***NO. 54 (NO. 2-2) DIVISION III MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — SPORTS-SPONSORSHIP REQUIREMENTS**

Intent: To increase the sports-sponsorship requirements for Division III institutions and conferences from four men's and four women's sports to five sports for each gender, and to increase team sports-sponsorship requirements from two men's and two women's team sports to three sports for each gender.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.2.1.4, page 9, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"3.2.1.4 *Four* **Five-Sport/Three-Season Requirement.** The institution shall sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of *four* **five** varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females and *four* **five** varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-female teams, subject to the requirements of the institution's conference(s), if any. At least one sport involving an all-male team or a mixed team of males and females and at least one sport involving an all-female team shall be conducted in every sport season. An institution may utilize a sport to meet the three-season requirement only if the institution has met the minimum contest and participants requirements for sports sponsorship in that sport as set forth in 20.9.3.3 (Division I), 20.10.3.5 (Division II) or 20.11.3.2 (Division III). See 3.2.4.11 for details of the member's obligations in meeting this requirement."

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to Bylaw 3 to reflect the adoption of this legislation]

B. Constitution: Amend 3.3.2.2.3, page 13, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"3.3.2.2.3 **Four Five-Sport/Three-Season Requirement.** The member conference shall conduct conference competition in at least **four five** sports for men, with at least one in each season, for the conference to vote on issues related solely to men's programs and **four five** sports for women, with at least one in each season, for the conference to vote on issues related solely to women's programs. A season-ending tournament or round-robin regular-season play in a sport shall satisfy the conference competition requirement for that sport."

C. Bylaws: Amend 20.11.3, pages 435-437, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"20.11.3 Sports Sponsorship. A member of Division III shall sponsor in Division III a minimum of:

"(a) **Four Five** varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least **two three** team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.11.3.2 and involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females, except when a waiver has been granted per 3.2.4.11.4, and

"(b) **Four Five** varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least **two three** team sports, based on the minimum requirements of 20.11.3.2 and involving all-female teams, except when a waiver has been granted per 3.2.4.11.4."

[Remainder of 20.11.3 unchanged]

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Division III Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure).

Effective Date: August 1, 2001.

Rationale: This proposal will help ensure that all Division III institutions fulfill minimal sports-sponsorship requirements, consistent with the principle of a broad-based athletics program. The proposal is consistent with the 1996 Convention survey results, which indicated the membership's strong support for increasing the current sports-sponsorship requirements. The delayed effective date—August 1, 2001—should provide ample opportunity for institutions to comply with these new requirements. A process will continue to exist to permit the consideration of legitimate waiver requests on a case-by-case basis.

Action: Adopted in Division III (242-44-18).

***NO. 55 (NO. 2-4) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — PROVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP**

Intent: To increase the length of the provisional membership period

from three to four years and to specify that the new year shall be an additional educational year, during which the institution shall apply NCAA legislation to the greatest extent possible.

A. Constitution: Amend 3.6, pages 17-18, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"3.6 PROVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP

"3.6.1 Eligibility

"3.6.1.1 Types of Institutions. Provisional membership is available to four-year colleges and universities and two-year upper-level collegiate institutions, accredited by the appropriate regional accrediting agency and duly elected to provisional membership under the provisions of 3.6.3.

"3.6.1.1.1 Three Four-Year Provision. Provisional membership shall be limited to a **three four**-year period. At the end of the **three four**-year period, a provisional member shall be eligible to apply for active membership (see 3.2.3).

"3.6.1.2 Compliance with Association Rules. A provisional member shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

"3.6.1.2.1 Three Four-year Progression. During the first **and second** years of provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the **second and third and fourth** years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

[3.6.1.3 unchanged.]

"3.6.1.4 Four-Sport/Three-Season Requirement. After one two years of provisional membership, the institution shall sponsor and conduct a representative schedule in a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all male teams or mixed teams of males and females and four varsity intercollegiate sports that involve all-female teams, subject to the requirements of the institution's conference(s), if any. An institution may utilize a sport to meet the three-season requirement only if the institution has met the minimum contest and participants requirements for sports sponsorship in that sport as set forth in 20.9.3.3 (Division I), 20.10.3.5 (Division II) or 20.11.3.2 (Division III). (See 3.6.4.5 regarding the provisional member's obligations in meeting this requirement.)

[3.6.2 and 3.6.3 unchanged.]

"3.6.4 Conditions and Obligations of Membership

"3.6.4.1 General. During the first **and second** years of the

three **four**-year provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the *second and third* **and fourth** years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics program in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association.

[3.6.4.2 and 3.6.4.3 unchanged.]

"3.6.4.4 Coaches Certification. During the *second and third* **and fourth** years of provisional membership, coaches of provisional members in Divisions I and II shall be certified to recruit off campus per 11.5.

"3.6.4.5 Compliance Period. Following the institution's *first second* year of provisional membership, a provisional member shall fulfill the conditions and obligations applicable to active members per 3.2.4.3 through 3.2.4.12, except that the waivers described in 3.2.4.11.5 and 3.2.4.11.6 shall not apply."

[Remainder of 3.6 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.02.3, page 413, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"20.02.3 Provisional Membership. Provisional membership is a prerequisite for active membership. It is limited to a *three four*-year period. During the *second and third* **and fourth** years of provisional membership, an institution shall administer its athletics programs in accordance with the constitution, bylaws and other legislation of the Association."

C. Bylaws: Amend 20.2.2, page 414, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"20.2.2 *Three Four*-Year Provision. Provisional membership shall be limited to a *three four*-year period. During the *first and second* years of provisional membership, an institution shall apply the legislation of the Association to the greatest extent possible. During the *second and third* **and fourth** years of provisional membership, an institution shall operate in conformity with the membership criteria of this article."

Source: NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Transition Oversight Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997; for institutions petitioning for provisional membership on or after August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The establishment of an additional year of provisional membership will assist the Association's educational efforts related to its provisional members. The current one-year educational period does not afford provisional members adequate time to prepare for the final two years of provisional membership, when full compliance with NCAA legislation is required. Because no waiver opportunities exist during those final two provisional years, institutions that are not in full compliance lose

their provisional status. Establishing a second educational year will benefit both the provisional members and the Association as a whole.

Action: Adopted (Division I: 311-10-1; Division II: 227-11-2; Division III: 235-59-9).

***NO. 56 (NO. 2-5) DIVISION II MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — PROVISIONAL MEMBERSHIP**

Intent: To require Division II provisional members to complete an educational assessment during their provisional membership period.

Constitution: Amend 3.6.4 by adding new 3.6.4.3, page 18, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"3.6.4.3 Educational Assessment. During the provisional membership period, a Division II provisional member shall complete an NCAA educational program regarding requirements for active membership status in Division II."

[3.6.4.3 through 3.6.4.5 renumbered as 3.6.4.4 through 3.6.4.6, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Presidents Commission (Division II Presidents Council Transition Team).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997; for institutions petitioning for Division II provisional membership on or after August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This additional requirement during the provisional membership period will assure that Division II provisional members are being educated about the requirements they must meet and the legislation with which they must comply in order to be accepted as active members.

Action: Adopted in Division II (230-6-2).

NO. 57 (NO. 2-136) ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION — OPERATING PRINCIPLES

Intent: To incorporate sportsmanship and ethical conduct as specific components in the athletics certification program.

A. Bylaws: Amend 23.2.1, pages 461-462, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"23.2.1 Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance

"23.2.1.1 Institutional Mission. Maintaining intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program is a basic purpose of the Association. Consistent with this fundamental policy, the mission and goals of the athletics pro-

gram shall:

[23.2.1.1-(a) through 23.2.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) Result from a process of development and periodic review involving substantive participation by the major constituent groups of the institution; and

“(f) Be reflected in the actual practices of the institution’s athletics program; and

“(g) **Embrace the principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct.**”

B. Bylaws: Amend 23.2.4 by adding new 23.2.4.4, page 463, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“23.2.4 *Commitment to* **Equity, Welfare and Sportsmanship**

[23.2.4.1 through 23.2.4.3 unchanged.]

“**23.2.4.4 Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct.** Consistent with the Association’s principle of sportsmanship and ethical conduct, the institution shall demonstrate that in the area of intercollegiate athletics, it is committed to positively reinforcing fundamental values of respect, fairness, civility, honesty and responsibility. It shall have in place a regular and ongoing educational program related to sportsmanship and ethical conduct for student-athletes, coaches, administrators, alumni, support groups, spectators and all others associated with the intercollegiate athletics experience. There shall be established written policies and procedures for sportsmanship and ethical conduct in intercollegiate athletics, consistent with the educational mission and goals of the institution and responsive to the values of this operating principle. The institution shall provide evidence of effective practices in this area.”

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Athletics Certification).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997, beginning with an institution’s second cycle of certification.

Rationale: This proposal is consistent with the directive contained in 1996 Convention Proposal No. 12 (resolution: sportsmanship and ethical conduct) and will hold institutions accountable for establishing an intercollegiate athletics environment that is consistent with the principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct.

Action: Part A adopted in Division I (318-8-0). Part B referred to new governance structure in Division I (201-15-1).

NO. 58 (NO. 2-3) ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION — DIVISION I

Intent: To change the next athletics certification cycle from at least

once every five years to at least once every 10 years, and to provide for a five-year interim status report.

Constitution: Amend 3.2.4.7, page 11, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“3.2.4.7 Athletics Certification — Division I. To meet the provisions of the athletics certification program of the Association, Division I member institutions shall complete, at least once every five 10 years, an institutional self-study, verified and evaluated through external peer review, in accordance with the Association’s constitution and bylaws. A Division II or III institution that sponsors a sport in Division I is not required to participate in the athletics certification program.

“**3.2.4.7.1 Five-Year Interim Status Report.** An institution shall provide the NCAA Committee on Athletics Certification with a five-year status report on how the institution is complying with those elements of its initial certification that required correction or modification. The report will require no action on the part of the certification committee, but shall be used as part of the second cycle of certification to ascertain compliance with the initial-certification requirements.”

“**3.2.4.7.2 Sequencing of Certification within 10-Year Cycle.** An institution will remain in the same sequence for completing athletics certification in the 10-year cycle as it was under the initial five-year cycle but will have an expanded time period for the certification process to be scheduled.

“**3.2.4.7.2.1 Appeal of Sequencing.** An institution may appeal to the Committee on Athletics Certification to have its scheduled athletics certification reordered from the original five-year cycle of athletics certification.”

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Continent and Missouri Valley Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997; beginning with the institution’s second athletics certification cycle.

Rationale: While a five-year cycle of initial certification is proper, a continuing program is more suited for a 10-year cycle that will lower institutional operating costs and time commitment for certification. The inclusion of a five-year interim status report will continue to provide a measuring tool in the second cycle of certification of how an institution is complying with initial-certification recommendations. The revised 10-year cycle of athletics certification is not intended to allow institutions to resequence when they are scheduled to start their next certification, rather to extend the time frame under which they may be scheduled. For example, an institution that completed its first athletics cer-

tification in cycle No. 1 (year No. 1) of the initial five-year certification period would still remain in cycle No. 1 of the 10-year certification period (year Nos. 1-2). An institution could appeal its sequencing in the new 10-year certification period to the Committee on Athletics Certification, which would be authorized to develop criteria for approving such requests.

Committee Position (Committee on Athletics Certification):

The committee recommended that the sponsors withdraw this proposal in order to permit the committee to complete its study of changes for the second cycle of the program. As an alternative, the committee suggested that the sponsors consider clarifying (possibly through changes to the rationale statement) how schools would be scheduled in the second 10-year cycle. The committee expressed concern that, as written, this proposal may permit an institution that participated early in the first five-year cycle to engage in its next self-study late in the second cycle and, therefore, have more than 10 years between self-studies.

Action: Adopted as amended by No. 58-1 in Division I (310-15-1).

NO. 58-1 ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION — DIVISION I

Intent: To require the five-year interim status report to be acted on by the NCAA Committee on Athletics Certification; further, to remove the restrictions on the content of the report; finally, to indicate that an institution's certification in the 10-year cycle be scheduled in accordance with the principles outlined in 33.3.

Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 58-1, 3.2.4.7, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

[3.2.4.7 unchanged.]

"3.2.4.7.1 Five-Year Interim Status Report. An institution shall provide the NCAA Committee on Athletics Certification with a five-year status report *on how the institution is complying with those elements of its initial certification that required correction or modification*. The report **will be in a form prescribed by the committee**, will require *no* action on the part of the certification committee, *but* **and** shall be used as part of the **next** second cycle of certification to ascertain compliance with the *initial*-certification requirements."

"3.2.4.7.2 Sequencing **Scheduling** of Certification within 10-Year Cycle. An institution's **athletics certification** will *remain in the same sequence for completing athletics certification* **be scheduled** in the 10-year cycle *as it was under the initial five-year cycle but will have an expanded time period for the certification process to be scheduled* **by the Committee on Athletics Certification in accordance with the principles outlined in 33.3.**

"3.2.4.7.2.1 Appeal of *Sequencing* **Scheduling**. An institution may appeal to the Committee on Athletics Certification to have its scheduled athletics certification re-

ordered from the original five-year cycle of athletics certification modified according to the provisions of 33.3.1.2."

Source: NCAA Council (Administrative Committee and Committee on Athletics Certification).

Rationale: The Committee on Athletics Certification believes that it is necessary to take action on the five-year interim report in order to provide the institution appropriate feedback and guidance for the next certification cycle. For similar reasons, the committee believes the content of the report should not be limited to elements that required correction or modification in the first cycle.

Action: Adopted in Division I (293-33-0).

NO. 59 (NO. 2-59) AMATEURISM — MEDIA ACTIVITIES

Intent: To permit student-athletes greater access to participate in media activities (e.g., film and stage, and writing projects) as specified.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.5.3, page 106, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"12.5.3 Radio and Television Appearances. If a student-athlete's appearance on radio or television is related in any way to athletics ability or prestige, the student-athlete shall not receive any remuneration for that appearance; nor shall the student-athlete make any endorsement, expressed or implied, of any commercial product or service. The student-athlete may, however, receive legitimate and normal expenses directly related to such an appearance, provided it occurs within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus. The institution may provide such expenses for such an appearance in the general locale of an institution's away-from-home competition (also see 16.1.7.4.)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.5 by adding new 12.5.3, page 106, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"12.5.3 Media Activities.

"(a) **During The Playing Season.** During the playing season, a student-athlete may appear on local radio and television programs (e.g., coaches shows) or engage in writing projects when the student-athlete's appearance or participation is related in any way to athletics ability or prestige, provided the student-athlete does not receive any remuneration for the appearance or participation in the activity. The student-athlete shall not make any endorsement, expressed or implied, of any commercial product or service. The student-athlete may, however, receive legitimate and normal expenses directly related to the appearance or participation in the activity, provided it occurs within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus. The institution also may provide such expenses

for a student-athlete to appear on radio or television in the general locale of an institution's away-from-home competition.

(b) Outside The Playing Season. Outside the playing season, a student-athlete may participate in media activities (e.g., appearance on radio, television, in films or stage productions or participation in writing projects) when such appearance or participation is related in any way to athletics ability or prestige, provided the student-athlete is eligible academically to represent the institution and does not receive any remuneration for such appearance or participation. The student-athlete may not make any endorsement, expressed or implied, of any commercial product or service. The student-athlete may, however, receive legitimate and normal expenses directly related to such appearance or participation, provided the source of the expenses is the entity sponsoring the activity."

C. Bylaws: Amend 12.5 by adding new 12.5.3, page 106, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

"12.5.3 Media Activities. A student-athlete may participate in media activities (e.g., appearance on radio, television, in films or stage productions, or participate in writing projects) when the student-athlete's appearance or participation is related in any way to athletics ability or prestige. A student-athlete may receive legitimate and normal expenses directly related to such an appearance or participation. The student-athlete may engage in such activities at any time and may receive compensation at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locale for similar services. Further, the student-athlete's name may be used to advertise his or her participation in such activity, provided the student-athlete's status as a student-athlete is not used for promotional purposes."

D. Bylaws: Amend 16.1.7.4, page 237, as follows:
[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"16.1.7.4 Awards Expenses From Media. A student-athlete may accept actual and necessary transportation expenses from a magazine or other media enterprise (e.g., newspaper, radio station, television network) for travel to a particular location (outside a 30-mile radius of the community in which the student-athlete's institution is located) in order to have a photograph or film taken or a story written about him or her, but only if the photograph, film or story is in conjunction with the receipt of an established award at that location (see 16.10.1.3)."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism and Communications Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is designed specifically as a student-ath-

lete welfare issue. It is a step toward enhancing the student-athlete's overall experience, thereby encouraging more student-athletes to take full advantage of the educational opportunities related to participation in intercollegiate competition. Further, in the spirit of federation, each division has proposed standards regarding a student-athlete's participation in media-related activities that it believes is appropriate for that division.

Action: Parts A and D adopted (718-13-1). Part B adopted (Division I: 289-5-0; Division II: 187-3-0). Part C adopted in Division III (237-5-3).

NO. 60 (NO. 2-85) VEHICLE REGISTRATION — DIVISION I FOOTBALL AND BASKETBALL

Intent: To require counters in the sports of Division I football and basketball to register with the department of athletics any vehicles owned or regularly used by the student-athlete and to include such a requirement as part of the student-athlete statement.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.3.1 by adding new 14.1.3.1.1, page 156, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.1.3.1.1 Vehicle Registration — Division I Football and Basketball. Student-athletes who are counters in the sports of Division I football and basketball must register with the department of athletics any vehicle owned or regularly used by the student-athlete, including any information related to payment, loan, insurance and registration."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Most abuses that occur regarding agent matters relate to Division I football and basketball. In a significant number of cases, automobiles are loaned or provided to a student-athlete or family member by an agent. This proposal will assist an institution in maintaining control of its affairs and serve as a deterrent to student-athletes who might otherwise accept such a benefit.

Action: Defeated upon reconsideration in Division I-A (13-102-0); defeated in Division I-AA (18-101-2); defeated in Division I (for basketball) (134-180-2).

NO. 61 (NO. 2-86) AGENT DOCUMENTS — PARENTS AND RELATIVES

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To require student-athletes and their parents and relatives

to provide relevant documents to authorized institutional representatives related to an agent inquiry and include such a requirement as part of the student-athlete statement.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.3.1 by adding new 14.1.3.1.1, page 156, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"14.1.3.1.1 Agent Documents — Parents and Relatives. A student-athlete's signature on the student-athlete statement also shall contain as a condition of his or her eligibility the requirement that the student-athlete and his or her parents [or legal guardian(s)] and relatives must provide relevant documents for an agent inquiry when requested to do so by an authorized representative of the institution, the conference office or the NCAA."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Currently, student-athletes and their relatives are not required by legislation to turn over documents related to an agent inquiry. This proposal would allow the NCAA to process eligibility cases related to agents more effectively. Through this process, agents will think twice before conferring benefits on student-athletes and their relatives.

Action: Withdrawn

NO. 62 (NO. 2-103) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS

Intent: To permit Division I student-athletes to earn legitimate on- and off-campus employment income during semester or term time, provided such income in combination with other financial aid included in the student-athlete's individual limit does not exceed the student's cost of attendance at the institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.1.1, page 208, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.4.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

"(a) Employment. Employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term), except for the legitimate on- or off-campus employment of Division I student-athletes who may receive earnings up to the cost of attendance per 15.2.6.1 and the legitimate off-campus employment of Division II stu-

dent-athletes (also see 15.2.6)."

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.6 by adding new 15.2.6.1, page 212, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.2.6.1 Exception — Division I Employment Earnings. In Division I, a student-athlete may receive earnings from legitimate on- or off-campus employment during semester or term time in combination with other financial aid included in the student-athlete's individual financial aid limit up to the student's cost of attendance, provided:

"(a) The student-athlete has spent one academic year in residence at the certifying institution;

"(b) The employment occurs outside the declared playing season in that sport; and

"(c) The student-athlete is eligible academically to compete for the institution."

[15.2.6.1 through 15.2.6.6 renumbered as 15.2.6.2 through 15.2.6.7, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Agents and Amateurism and Committee of Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The passage of this proposal would provide student-athletes with an opportunity to improve their own financial situations and take advantage of the full benefit of undergraduate life to the same extent as other students. Current NCAA rules aimed at preventing abuses related to employment compensation would continue to apply (e.g., compensation must be for work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with experience). In addition, most Division I institutions have established compliance systems to monitor the employment activities of student-athletes because many likely obtain jobs with the same employers they worked for during the summer. The amount of institutional dollars expended on on-campus employment and the time athletics departments would spend finding jobs for student-athletes would be minimized. Even if the adoption of this proposal results in more administrative work and higher expenses, such costs are outweighed by the benefit of addressing a significant student-athlete welfare issue.

Action: Adopted as amended by No. 62-1 in Division I (169-150-6).

NO. 62-1 FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS

Intent: To require a student-athlete prior to commencement of employment to sign an affidavit as specified to be kept on file in the

athletics department.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 62-B, by adding new 15.2.6.1.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“15.2.6.1.1 Signed Affidavit. Prior to the commencement of the employment, the student-athlete and the employer must sign an affidavit to be kept on file in the athletics department, which specifies the following:

“(a) The student-athlete has not been hired based on his or her athletics ability or the value that the student-athlete may have for the employer because of the athletics reputation or fame the student-athlete has achieved;

“(b) The student-athlete is to be compensated only for work actually performed; and

“(c) The student-athlete is to be compensated at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for similar services.”

Source: NCAA Council (Committee of Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Rationale: The requirement that a student-athlete, prior to commencing employment, sign an affidavit attesting to the above-mentioned conditions will provide an added safeguard and decrease opportunity for abuse of this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division I (190-127-6) after paragraph B in Part B was separated and defeated (78-237-5).

NO. 63 (NO. 2-105) FINANCIAL AID — EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS — DIVISION I

Intent: In Division I, to exempt employment earnings from counting in a student-athlete's individual full grant-in-aid limitations and the institution's sport limitations under specified conditions.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.1.1, page 208, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.4.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

“(a) Employment. Employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term), except for the **legitimate on- or off-campus employment of Division I student-athletes pursuant to 15.2.6.1** and the legitimate off-campus employment of Division II student-athletes (also see 15.2.6);”

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.6 by adding new 15.2.6.1, pages 212-213, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“15.2.6.1 Exception — Division I Employment Earnings. Earnings from a Division I student-athlete's legitimate on- or off-campus employment during the academic year shall be exempt from counting in the student-athlete's full grant-in-aid limitations and the institution's sport limitations, provided the employment has been approved by the athletics director and compliance coordinator.

“15.2.6.1.1 Signed Affidavit. Prior to the commencement of the employment, the student-athlete and the employer must sign an affidavit to be kept on file in the athletics department, which specifies the following:

“(a) The student-athlete has not been hired based on his or her athletics ability or the value that the student-athlete may have for the employer because of the athletics reputation or fame the student-athlete has achieved;

“(b) The student-athlete is to be compensated only for work actually performed; and

“(c) The student-athlete is to be compensated at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for similar services.

“15.2.6.1.2 Course-Curriculum Requirement. Employment that is a requirement of the student-athlete's course curriculum shall be exempt from these requirements.”

[15.2.6.1 renumbered as 15.2.6.2, unchanged.]

[Remainder of 15.2.6 deleted.]

Source: Boston College, University of Connecticut, Georgetown University, University of Miami (Florida), University of Pittsburgh, St. John's University (New York), Seton Hall University, Villanova University and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The NCAA should lessen the restraints on student-athletes' lives. Across the country, student-athlete advisory committees have made it known to administrators that the ability to work without having to include these earnings into their financial aid limitations is their number one concern. In the past, this proposal has been defeated due to the concerns that this rule would be abused.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee voted to ask the sponsors to consider withdrawing this proposal, inasmuch as the Council recently

agreed to sponsor a similar proposal that satisfactorily addresses this issue. The committee expressed hope that the sponsors will support the Council proposal and noted that they may want to consider proposing an amendment to the Council's proposal if they believe their proposal has some unique features that should be made part of the Council proposal. If the sponsors fail to withdraw Proposal No. 63, the committee opposes the proposal as currently written.

Action: Moot.

NO. 63-1 FINANCIAL AID — EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS — DIVISION I

Intent: To specify additional conditions (i.e., completion of freshman year, meeting satisfactory-progress requirements) that must be satisfied to exempt employment earnings from counting in a student-athlete's individual full grant-in-aid limitations and the institution's sport limitations.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 63-B, 15.2.6.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.2.6.1 Exception — Division I Employment Earnings. Earnings from a Division I student-athlete's legitimate on- or off-campus employment during the academic year shall be exempt from counting in the student-athlete's full grant-in-aid limitations and the institution's sport limitations, provided **the student-athlete has completed his or her freshman year and is meeting applicable NCAA, conference and institutional satisfactory-progress requirements** and the employment has been approved by the athletics director and compliance coordinator."

[15.2.6.1.1 and 15.2.6.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big East Conference.

Rationale: This amendment will ensure that a student-athlete's employment will not interfere with his or her academic progress by requiring the student-athlete to have completed his or her freshman year and to have met necessary academic requirements.

Action: Moot.

NO. 64 (NO. 2-104) FINANCIAL AID — EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS — DIVISION I

Intent: To permit Division I student-athletes to exempt legitimate off-campus employment earnings from the full grant-in-aid limit.

A. Bylaws: Amend 15.1.1, page 208, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.4.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

"(a) Employment. Employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term), except for the legitimate off-campus employment of Divisions **I and II** student-athletes (also see 15.2.6);"

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 15.2.6.1, page 212, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.2.6.1 Exception — Divisions **I and II** Employment Earnings. Earnings from a Division **I or II** student-athlete's legitimate off-campus employment, in excess of a full grant-in-aid shall be exempt, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment. Earnings from such employment by a representative of the institution's athletics interest may be exempted, provided the student-athlete secures the employment in the same manner as other members of the general public."

Source: Boston College, University of Connecticut, University of Miami (Florida), University of Notre Dame, University of Pittsburgh, St. John's University (New York), Seton Hall University, Syracuse University, Villanova University and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The NCAA should lessen the restraints on student-athletes' lives. Across the country, student-athlete advisory committees have made it known to administrators that the ability to work without having to include these earnings into their financial aid limitations is their number one concern. In the past, this proposal has been defeated due to the concerns that this rule would be abused.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee voted to ask the sponsors to consider withdrawing this proposal, inasmuch as the Council recently agreed to sponsor a similar proposal that satisfactorily addresses this issue. The committee expressed hope that the sponsors will support the Council proposal and noted that they may want to consider proposing an amendment to the Council's proposal if they believe their proposal has some unique features that should be made part of the Council proposal. If the sponsors fail to withdraw Proposal No. 64, the committee opposes the proposal as currently written.

Action: Moot.

NO. 64-1 FINANCIAL AID — EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS — DIVISION I

Intent: To require a Division I student-athlete to have completed his or her freshman year and to have met applicable NCAA, conference and institutional satisfactory-progress requirements in order to exempt off-campus employment earnings from a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid limit.

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 64-A, 15.1.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.4.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

"(a) Employment. Employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term), except for the legitimate off-campus employment of Divisions I and II student-athletes (also see 15.2.6). **In Division I, a student-athlete must have completed his or her freshman year and have met applicable NCAA, conference and institutional satisfactory-progress requirements in order to exclude such employment earnings.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal 64-B, 15.2.6.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.2.6.1 Exception — Divisions I and II Employment Earnings. Earnings from a Division I or II student-athlete's legitimate off-campus employment, in excess of a full grant-in-aid shall be exempt, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment. **In Division I, a student-athlete also must have completed his or her freshman year and have met applicable NCAA, conference and institutional satisfactory-progress requirements.** Earnings from such employment by a representative of the institution's athletics interest may be exempted, provided the student-athlete secures the employment in the same manner as other members of the general public."

Source: All members of the Big East Conference.

Rationale: This amendment will ensure that a student-athlete's employment will not interfere with his or her academic progress by requiring the student-athlete to have completed his or her freshman year and have met necessary academic requirements.

Action: Moot.

NO. 65 (NO. 2-108) FINANCIAL AID — SUMMER SCHOOL — DIVISION I

Intent: To permit a Division I institution to award athletics aid to a student prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, without increasing costs.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.7.1.2, page 214, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A and all other Division I members, divided vote, roll call]

"15.2.7.1.2 Summer Financial Aid — Prior to Initial, Full-Time Collegiate Enrollment. The following conditions apply to the awarding of financial aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution in the summer prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

[15.2.7.1.2-(a) and 15.2.7.1.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) During the summer term or orientation period, the recipient shall not engage in any organized athletics practice activities (pursuant to 17.02.12); and

"(d) **In Division I only, athletically related financial aid may be awarded for the summer term prior to full-time enrollment. In Divisions II and III, the awarding institution certifies shall certify** in writing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid;

"(e) **In Division I, the recipient shall be enrolled in not less than five credit hours;**

"(f) **In Division I, the recipient shall receive athletically related financial aid only in proportion to the amount of athletically related financial aid that the student will receive during the ensuing academic year and shall become a counter during the ensuing academic year per Bylaw 15.5; and**

"(g) **In Division I, the recipient shall be limited to not more than four additional summer terms of athletics aid."**

Source: Auburn University; Baylor University; Colorado State University; University of Florida; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Houston; Louisiana State University; University of Maryland, College Park; University of Missouri, Columbia; Oklahoma State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; Texas Tech University; and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This permissive legislation provides institutions the flexibility.

bility to provide athletically related financial aid to a student-athlete during the summer prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment. It also includes a provision that restricts summer aid to not more than four additional summer terms and, therefore, will not increase costs. Often, freshman academic casualties are a result of the pressures of adjusting to the collegiate atmosphere. This proposal will help freshmen succeed in the classroom and satisfy continuing-eligibility requirements. It also will provide a valuable indoctrination for these students. The proposal has the support of the NCAA Division I Steering Committee.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee's position on this proposal was divided with the Division I members supporting the proposal and the Division II members opposing the proposal. The Division I members supported this proposal because it may permit more incoming students to academically prepare for college. The Division II members noted that this proposal may lead to increased costs for all institutions because most schools do not routinely provide five years of summer financial aid; however, this proposal may force institutions to provide such aid to compete with other institutions that provide it. The Division II members further noted that the summer orientation program for all students prior to the commencement of the academic year is sufficient to acclimate players to the adjustments of collegiate life.

Action: Defeated in Division I-A (43-70-5); not moved in Division I.

NO. 66 (NO. 2-109) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

Intent: To increase the maximum number of grants-in-aid in Division I men's basketball from 13 to 14.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.4.1, page 225, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.4.1 Men's Basketball — Division I. There shall be an annual limit of 13 14 on the total number of counters in the sport of men's basketball at each Division I institution."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The increase in attrition of student-athletes and prospective student-athletes to the NBA has created additional challenges to field teams and recruit prospective student-athletes. Over the past seven years, in excess of 120 prospective student-athletes and underclassmen have left the collegiate ranks to pursue professional basketball, including over 30 who entered the NBA draft in 1996 (the first seven draft picks in the 1996 NBA draft were underclassmen). In addition to the increased attrition to professional basketball, teams are also affected by injury, illness, and transfer. This proposal would not only allow

more flexibility for institutions to address attrition and recruiting issues, but also provide more participation opportunities in a sport that is among the top three NCAA sports in the percentage of minority student-athlete participation.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee agreed to support this proposal for the following reasons:

- The committee believes that in previous years, the Association has helped create more participation opportunities in women's sports (e.g., identification of emerging sports for women, increased grant limits in some women's sports) and the addition of one men's basketball scholarship in Division I will not markedly alter this balance.
- The committee is of the opinion that, because basketball programs are often primary revenues producers on many Division I campuses, those efforts to assist other sports programs at those institutions should be recognized and supported.
- The committee believes that the new eligibility standards (e.g., the new sliding scale) will cause attrition in the number of qualified student-athletes and prospective student-athletes, resulting in fewer institutions being in a position to offer a fourteenth scholarship to an eligible student-athlete. Therefore, this proposal will not have much of a cost impact.
- The committee noted that its grant-limits study conducted in 1994 revealed that men's basketball was one of the top sports in the number of minority participants. The committee stressed that this racial equity component should be recognized in order to assist in providing scholarship opportunities for minority participants.

Finally, the committee suggested that the sponsors modify the rationale statement to include the racial equity component as part of the rationale for the proposal. The sponsors have modified the proposal's rationale statement as suggested by the committee.

Action: Defeated in Division I (81-235-4).

NO. 67 (NO. 2-95) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — PARTIAL QUALIFIER — DIVISION I

Intent: To revise the definition of partial qualifier to include students who present a core-curriculum grade-point average of 2.500 and an SAT score of 810 or an ACT score of 67 and to include students who present core-curriculum grade-point averages from 2.475 to 2.250 and SAT scores of 820 or above or ACT scores of 68 or above.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.2.1.1, page 170, as follows:
[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.2.1.1 Definition — Division I. In Division I, a partial qualifier is a student who does not meet the requirements for a quali-

fier but who, at the time of graduation from high school, presents the following core-curriculum grade-point average and the corresponding ACT or SAT score:

Core GPA	SAT*	SAT Recentred**	SUM ACT
"2.750 & above	600	720	59
"2.725	610	730	59
"2.700	620	730	60
"2.675	630	740-750	61
"2.650	640	760	62
"2.625	650	770	63
"2.600	660	780	64
"2.575	670	790	65
"2.550	680	800	66
"2.525	690	810	67
"2.500	690	810	67
"2.475-2.250	700 & above	820 & above	68 & above

*If taken prior to April 1, 1995.

**If taken on or subsequent to April 1, 1995."

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Florida; University of Georgia; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi; University of South Carolina, Columbia; and University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The current NCAA initial-eligibility legislation, effective August 1, 1996, has raised standards to a point where there will be prospects with the necessary academic background to succeed at the collegiate level who are nonqualifiers. Further, the eligibility standards provide only a very narrow definition of a partial qualifier, while increasing the number of nonqualifiers. This proposal will provide more opportunities for a prospect to achieve partial-qualifier status, thus, allowing access to financial aid and practice opportunities.

Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The committee believes that it is necessary to establish some stability within the initial-eligibility legislation.

Action: Defeated in Division I (86-230-6).

NO. 68 (NO. 2-96) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — PARTIAL QUALIFIER — DIVISION I

Intent: In Division I, to permit a partial qualifier to earn a fourth season of competition, provided the student-athlete receives a baccalaureate degree prior to the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial, full-time enrollment.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.3 by adding new 14.3.3.1, page 171, as follows:

A-138

Legislative Proposals

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.3.1 Fourth Season of Competition — Division I — Partial Qualifier. A fourth season of intercollegiate competition shall be granted to a partial qualifier (per 14.02.9.2), provided that at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has received a baccalaureate degree."

Source: All members of the Atlantic 10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal represents a compromise that meets the concerns of those who have emphasized raising the initial academic eligibility standards to achieve higher graduation rates and those who believe the criteria used to establish initial eligibility are not always an accurate indication of a prospect's ability to earn a baccalaureate degree. This proposal permits a partial qualifier who is able to successfully complete the degree requirements in four calendar years (four academic years and three or four summers) to earn a fourth season of competition and, thereby, be able to publicly remove the partial-qualifier stigma that otherwise remains with the student-athlete throughout his or her life. This provides the opportunity for those who have been misguided or have experienced trauma or other negative events in their teenage years to overcome the penalty they have had to deal with as a result of being classified as a partial qualifier. Finally, due to the newly implemented definition of a partial qualifier, it accommodates the relatively few prospects who have achieved the minimum grade-point average of 2.500 in 13 core courses, but who lack the corresponding test score.

Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. At this time, the committee does not believe that it is in the Association's best interest to award additional seasons of competition for a group of students who do not meet the initial-eligibility standards coming out of high school. The committee continues to believe that the Association's initial-eligibility standards create a significant incentive for young people to better prepare themselves for the student-athlete experience and that this proposal may have the unintended effect of lessening this preparation. In addition, concern was expressed regarding the awarding of seasons of competition once a student has achieved a baccalaureate degree, which generally should represent the culmination of the student-athlete experience.

Action: Adopted in Division I (173-145-7).

NO. 69 (NO. 2-99) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — PARTIAL QUALIFIER OR NONQUALIFIER — DIVISION I

Intent: In the sports of football and men's and women's basketball,

Legislative Proposals

A-139

to require a two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier to fulfill one academic year in residence at the certifying institution prior to being eligible for competition.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4.1, pages 182-83, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“14.5.4.1 To Division I Institutions

[14.5.4.1.1 unchanged.]

[14.5.4.1.1.1 unchanged.]

“14.5.4.1.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — Sports Other Than Football and *Men's* Basketball. In sports other than football and *men's* basketball, a student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). In addition, such a student must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2).

[14.5.4.1.2.1 unchanged.]

“14.5.4.1.3 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — Football and *Men's* Basketball. In the sports of football and *men's* basketball, a student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is not eligible for competition during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution. Such a student is eligible for institutional financial aid and practice the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). In addition, such a student must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2).

“14.5.4.1.3.1 Exception. A two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier and who has successfully completed at least 35 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition during the first academic year in residence if the student has met the requirements of 14.5.4.1.2.”

[14.5.4.1.3.2 through 14.5.4.1.3.4 renumbered as 14.5.4.1.3.1 through 14.5.4.1.3.3, unchanged.]

Source: University of Florida; Clemson University; Duke University; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Maryland, College Park; North Carolina State University; University of Ten-

nessee, Knoxville; Villanova University; and University of Virginia.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997; for those students first entering a two-year collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The NCAA enforcement staff and the NCAA Recruiting Committee have provided information indicating that recruiting and academic abuses related to two-year college transfer students occur more frequently in the high-profile sports of football and men's basketball. In addition, transfer students in those sports graduate at rates significantly below those of other transfer student-athletes and transfer students in general. The sponsors do not believe that the “35-percent” amendment to 1996 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 23 will have a meaningful impact on these lower graduation rates. The establishment of a mandatory “red-shirt” year would benefit these student-athletes, as well as those in women's basketball who face many of the same adjustment issues, by providing an easier academic transition and requiring them to demonstrate satisfactory progress at the certifying institution.

Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee and Two-Year College Relations Committee): The Academic Requirements Committee took no position on this proposal. The Two-Year College Relations Committee opposes this proposal. The committee believes the current legislation appropriately addresses the concerns related to the academic preparation of two-year college transfers who are not qualifiers.

Action: Withdrawn in Division I.

NO. 70 (NO. 2-97) SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — HOURS EARNED DURING REGULAR ACADEMIC YEAR

Intent: To reduce from 75 percent to 62.5 percent the minimum number of satisfactory-progress credit hours that a freshman student-athlete must earn during the academic year, and to increase from 25 percent to 37.5 percent the minimum number of satisfactory-progress credit hours that a freshman student-athlete may earn during the summer.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.1.3 by adding new 14.4.3.1.3.1, page 174, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“14.4.3.1.3.1 Exception — Incoming Freshman. During the first academic year of collegiate enrollment, a student-athlete shall earn at least 62.5 percent of the minimum number of semester or quarter hours required for satisfactory progress during the regular academic year. The student-athlete shall earn not more than 37.5 percent of

the minimum number of semester or quarter hours required for satisfactory progress during the summer or through correspondence courses taken during the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter."

[14.4.3.1.3.1 through 14.4.3.1.3.3 renumbered as 14.4.3.1.3.2 through 14.4.3.1.3.4, unchanged.]

Source: Brigham Young University; Colorado State University; University of Georgia; University of Houston; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Northeast Louisiana University; University of Oklahoma; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Tennessee; Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: It generally is recognized that the freshman year presents the most problems for students as they become acclimated to college life both academically and socially. This proposal is designed to assist freshmen and provide them some flexibility to meet the requirements of the satisfactory-progress rule and maintain eligibility.

Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The committee believes that the "75/25" rule, which previously was adopted by the membership in 1992, is well-understood at this point and represents an appropriate distribution for all students—including freshmen—in regard to completion of academic work during the regular academic year.

Action: Withdrawn in Division I.

NO. 71 (NO. 2-90) ELIGIBILITY — PARTICIPATION AFTER 21ST BIRTHDAY

Intent: To specify that in Division II, as in Division I, any participation by an individual in organized competition during any 12-month period after the individual's 21st birthday and prior to initial full-time enrollment at a collegiate institution counts as a year of competition in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.5, page 163, as follows:
[Division II only]

"14.2.4.5 Participation After 21st Birthday. Any participation as an individual or a team representative in organized sports competition by a student during each 12-month period after the student's 21st birthday and prior to initial full-time enrollment in a collegiate institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport. Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted.

"14.2.4.5.1 Track and Cross Country. A prospective stu-

dent-athlete who participates in outside competition after the student's 21st birthday during a cross country, indoor track and field or outdoor track and field sports season (as opposed to general road racing events) would be charged with at least one season of competition in the sport in which the student participated.

"14.2.4.5.2 Road Racing. A prospective student-athlete who participates in road racing activities after the student's 21st birthday and prior to enrollment in a member institution shall be charged with at least one season of competition in each of the sports of cross country, indoor track and outdoor track."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1997.

Rationale: If adopted, this proposal would require that an individual be charged with a season of competition for each year in which he or she participates in organized competition after his or her 21st birthday and prior to initial collegiate enrollment. This proposal is designed to equalize the opportunity for competitive athletics experience for individuals participating in NCAA competition, and to avoid a possible unfair advantage for scholarships and competition by more experienced athletes.

Action: Withdrawn in Division II.

NO. 72 (NO. 2-98) DIVISION III EXCEPTION TO TRANSFER RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who previously participated in intercollegiate athletics to transfer to a Division III institution and be immediately eligible for competition only if the student-athlete was academically and athletically eligible for competition at his or her previous institution at the time the student-athlete transferred from that institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.1.4, page 180, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

"14.5.1.4 Disciplinary Suspension. A student who transfers to a Division I or II any NCAA institution from a collegiate institution while the student is disqualified or suspended from the previous institution for disciplinary reasons (as opposed to academic reasons) must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.1, page 186, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

"14.5.5.3.1 Division III Exception. The student has not previously participated in intercollegiate athletics and transfers from a four-year collegiate institution to a Division III institution. If the student has ever participated in intercollegiate athletics, the student must have been academically and athletically eligible for competition had he or she remained at that institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee and Academic Requirements Committee) and Presidents Commission (Division III Subcommittee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The current Division III transfer rule permits a student-athlete who was a partial qualifier or nonqualifier at a Division I institution to enroll in a Division III institution after using three seasons of competition in Division I, in order to gain a fourth season of competition at the Division III institution. The recommendation to specify that the student-athlete also must be athletically eligible to return to his or her previous institution would preclude student-athletes from transferring from Division I to Division III only for the purpose of participation in a fourth season of competition. It also would preclude a Division I or II student who has not met the satisfactory-progress requirements from being eligible in Division III immediately upon transfer. The transfer rule should apply regardless of the student's sport and should include students who were suspended for disciplinary reasons at the previous institution.

Action: Part A adopted in Division III (292-9-3). Part B adopted in Division III (303-3-1).

NO. 73 (NO. 2-89) GRADUATE STUDENT — DIVISION III TRANSFER EXCEPTION

Intent: To permit a student-athlete who is enrolled in a Division III graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate to use the Division III transfer exceptions.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.7 by adding new 14.1.7.2, page 159, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"14.1.7.2 Division III Exception. A graduate student who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate may participate in intercollegiate athletics if the student has eligibility remaining per 14.2 and fulfills the conditions of any of the applicable Division III transfer exceptions (see 14.5.5.3.1, 14.5.5.3.3 and 14.5.5.3.8)."

[14.1.7.2 and 14.1.7.3 renumbered as 14.1.7.3 and 14.1.7.4, unchanged.]

Action: Adopted in Division II (147-88-7).

NO. 75 (NO. 2-117) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — DIVISION III BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit Division III institutions to commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions on October 15.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.2.1, page 280, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

"17.5.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to October 15 in Divisions I, and II and the fourth Saturday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(a) and 17.5.3-(b) in Division III."

[17.5.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.5.2.1.2 Prohibited Activities. Prior to October 15 in Divisions I, and II and the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(a) and 17.5.3-(b) in Division III, members of the institution's coaching staff may not be involved with one or more team members at any location in any of the following activities:

[Remainder of 17.5.2.1.2 unchanged.]

"17.5.2.1.2.1 Exception. Team promotional activities (e.g., autograph sessions, fan picture sessions, meeting with fans) per 12.5.1 are permissible prior to October 15 in Divisions I, and II and the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(a) and 17.5.3-(b) in Division III, provided these promotional arrangements do not involve any of the practice activities prohibited under the provisions of 17.5.2.1.2.

"17.5.2.1.2.2 Exception — Officiating Clinic. Prior to October 15 in Divisions I, and II and the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(a) and 17.5.3-(b) in Division III, student-athletes may observe an officiating clinic related to playing rules that is conducted by video conference, provided no student-athlete misses class time to observe the clinic."

Sources: All members of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference, Baldwin-Wallace College, Blackburn College, Buena Vista University, State University College at Cortland, Gallaudet University, Greensboro College, Johns Hopkins University, Marymount University (Virginia), Nazareth College, Norwich University, Ohio University, Salem State College, Savannah College of Art and Design, Virginia Wesleyan College, Wesleyan College (Georgia), and College of Wooster.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Allowing institutions to begin on-court preseason basketball practice sessions on October 15 permits more instructional time for the student-athlete. This proposal will allow a basketball coach to

actually begin teaching fundamentals and techniques on October 15, as opposed to only supervising conditioning activities. Because conditioning activities currently are permitted on October 15, this proposal would not result in any increase in the amount of time that a student-athlete is involved in athletically related activities.

Action: Defeated in Division III (74-212-11).

NO. 76 (NO. 2-122) MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS — DIVISION III BASKETBALL

Intent: In Division III basketball, to specify a student-athlete may participate in not more than 50 halves of basketball competition.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.5.1.3, page 282, as follows:
[Division III only, roll call]

“17.5.5.1.3 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in not more than 27 basketball contests in Divisions I and II or 25 **50 halves of basketball** contests in Division III. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution. Further, an individual student-athlete may participate each year in only one postseason basketball tournament as a member of the institution's varsity, junior varsity or freshman team.”

Source: All members of the Ohio Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Student-athletes who participate on the subvarsity level could participate in more varsity competition if half games were counted instead of whole games. Many players could play at the end of a lopsided varsity game and not be penalized an entire contest. In Division III, where maximum participation is paramount, this proposal would be more consistent with our philosophy. In addition, lopsided scores might not get further out of hand if subvarsity players were allowed to finish the game.

Action: Withdrawn in Division III.

NO. 77 (NO. 2-125) MAXIMUM CONTESTS LIMITATIONS — DIVISION III FOOTBALL

Intent: In Division III football, to specify that a student-athlete may participate in not more than 20 halves of football contests.

Bylaws: Amend 17.11.5.1.2, page 310, as follows:
[Division III football only, roll call]

“17.11.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in not more than 11 football contests in Divisions I and II and in

not more than **10 20 halves of** football games in Division III. This limitation includes those contest in which the student-athlete represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.”

Source: All members of the Ohio Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Student-athletes who participate on the subvarsity level could participate in more varsity competition if half games were counted instead of whole games. Many players could play at the end of a lopsided varsity game and not be penalized an entire contest. In Division III, where maximum participation is paramount, this proposal would be more consistent with our philosophy. In addition, lopsided scores might not get further out of hand if subvarsity players were allowed to finish the game.

Action: Referred to ad hoc committee of the Division III Management Council in Division III (229-51-12, football schools voting).

NO. 78 (NO. 2-123) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — DIVISION III FOOTBALL

Intent: In Division III, to permit student-athletes to wear shoulder pads during the three-day, noncontact, conditioning practice period.

Bylaws: Amend 17.11.2.3, page 309, as follows:

[Division III football only, roll call]

“17.11.2.3 Three-Day, Noncontact, Conditioning Practice Period. Physical activity during the first three days of the preseason practice period shall be limited to noncontact, conditioning drills. No football gear or protective equipment other than headgear, shoulder pads, *(in Divisions I and II only)* shoes, pants and porous, lightweight jerseys shall be worn by players during practice sessions in this three-day period.”

Source: All members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal would allow student-athletes in Division III to wear the same football equipment that currently is permitted in Divisions I and II during the noncontact period. The use of shoulder pads protect student-athletes from inadvertant contact with playing surfaces, teammates, sideline equipment, etc., prior to actual contact drills.

Action: Defeated in Division III (40-146-2, football schools voting).

Legislative Proposals

A-149

Amateurism/Benefits/Financial Aid

NO. 79 (NO. 2-55) AMATEURISM — LOAN AGAINST FUTURE EARNINGS

Intent: To permit student-athletes who are projected to be selected in the first round of the draft, and who have purchased insurance against a disabling injury or illness per 12.1.1.4.1, to secure a loan from a legitimate lending establishment against future earnings.

Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.4 by adding new 12.1.1.4.2, page 97, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.1.4.2 Exception For Securing Loan Against Future Earnings. An individual may apply for a loan against future earnings from an established, accredited lending institution, provided a third party (including a member institution's athletics department staff members, its professional sports counseling panel or representatives of its athletics interests) is not involved in arrangements for securing the loan. The student-athlete shall report all such transactions and shall file copies of the loan documents with the member institution. The student-athlete applying for such a loan must meet all of the following criteria:

"(a) Be rated by a collective body of professionals as a first round draft pick;

"(b) Be eligible for competition;

"(c) Have purchased insurance against a disabling injury or illness pursuant to 12.1.1.4.1; and

"(d) Be at the conclusion of his or her freshman, sophomore or junior season."

[12.1.1.4.2 through 12.1.1.4.8 renumbered as 12.1.1.4.3 through 12.1.1.4.9, unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Atlantic 10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: We are painfully aware of the forceful attraction of money to those who do not have it. By sanctioning a loan, perhaps the student-athlete will remain in school longer, thereby making collegiate teams more stable and reducing recruiting costs. It also may assist in easing financial burdens for the student-athlete's family. Finally, it may diminish the temptation to seek financial gain from agents.

Committee Position (Professional Sports Liaison Committee):
The committee took no position (although it supports the concept)

related to this proposal. The committee identified several issues that it believes the sponsors may wish to address prior to the 1997 Convention. Specifically, the committee noted the following items:

- More clarity may be needed on who will comprise the "collective body of professionals" who would make recommendations for the loans.
- Inasmuch as the NCAA Exceptional Student-Athlete Disability Insurance program now includes potential third-round picks for football and ice hockey, perhaps the sponsors should consider expanding the scope of this proposal beyond potential first-round draftees.
- It appears this proposal would apply to all collegiate sports, including those without scouting or rating services. Accordingly, if this proposal is meant to treat sports such as tennis, golf and track and field, who would comprise the collective body of professionals to review the student's potential as a professional athlete? Further, sports such as tennis, golf and track and field do not have a professional draft in which they would be selected. As a result, the committee believes that the sponsors may wish to identify clearly the intended group of student-athletes for whom this proposal would apply.

Action: Referred to new governance structures in Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 80 (NO. 2-56) AMATEURISM — BASKETBALL DRAFT

Intent: To preclude a student-athlete in the sport of basketball from being able to enter a professional league's draft without jeopardizing the student's intercollegiate eligibility in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 12.2.4.2.1, page 100, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.2.4.2.1 Exception — Professional Basketball Draft. A student-athlete in the sport of basketball may enter a professional league's draft one time during his or her collegiate career without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided the student-athlete declares his or her intention to resume intercollegiate participation within 30 days after the draft. The student-athlete's declaration of intent shall be in writing to the institution's director of athletics."

Source: Boston College, University of Connecticut, Georgetown University, University of Miami (Florida), University of Pittsburgh, St. John's University (New York), Syracuse University, Villanova University and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The professional draft rule has not assisted student-athletes due to the fact that the team that drafts the student-athlete maintains the right to that student-athlete even if the student-athlete decides to return to college. The regulation permitting student-athletes to determine their market value is sufficient to

help a student-athlete decide whether to become a professional.

Committee Position (Professional Sports Liaison Committee):

The committee took no position on this proposal. The committee noted that it has supported an alternative proposal for treating the professional draft issues by permitting those student-athletes who are not drafted to be eligible to return to school.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 81 (NO. 2-57) AMATEURISM — BASKETBALL DRAFT

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who is drafted by a professional basketball team no longer has remaining eligibility in that sport.

Bylaws: Amend 12.2.4.2.1, page 100, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.2.4.2.1 Exception — Professional Basketball Draft. A student-athlete in the sport of basketball may enter a professional league's draft one time during his or her collegiate career without jeopardizing eligibility in that sport, provided **the student-athlete is not drafted by any team in that league** and the student-athlete declares his or her intention to resume intercollegiate participation within 30 days after the draft. The student-athlete's declaration of intent shall be in writing to the institution's director of athletics."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The committee continues to support strongly the notion that student-athletes should have the opportunity to evaluate their potential market value without jeopardizing eligibility in a particular sport. This proposal is largely predicated on the National Basketball Association's development of an undergraduate advisory committee (like the National Football League's current undergraduate advisory committee), which would provide accurate draft information to student-athletes who wish to inquire about their professional draft status. If such a panel is created, it would continue to fulfill the committee's interest in permitting all students (regardless of potential draft status) the opportunity to ascertain their market value and, thus, the committee will withdraw this proposal. If such a panel has not been created as of the date of the 1997 Convention, this proposal will continue to afford those students who were not drafted the opportunity to return to school and complete their college education and basketball eligibility.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 82 (NO. 2-53) AMATEURISM — DISABLING INJURY OR ILLNESS

Intent: To clarify that a student-athlete must provide documenta-

tion of any insurance policy against a disabling injury or illness regardless of whether a loan is secured to purchase the insurance policy.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.4.1, page 97, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.1.4.1 Exception for Insurance Against Disabling Injury or Illness. An individual may borrow against his or her future earnings potential from an established, accredited commercial lending institution exclusively for the purpose of purchasing insurance (with no cash surrender value) against a disabling injury or illness that would prevent the individual from pursuing a chosen career, provided a third party (including a member institution's athletics department staff members, its professional sports counseling panel or representatives of its athletics interests) is not involved in arrangements for securing the loan. The student-athlete shall report all such transactions and shall file copies of the loan documents *and insurance policy* with the member institution. **The student-athlete also shall file copies of the insurance policy with the member institution, regardless of whether a loan is secured to purchase the insurance policy.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.12.1.4, page 249, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.12.1.4 Disabling-Injury Insurance. A student-athlete may borrow against his or her future earnings potential from an established, accredited commercial lending institution exclusively for the purpose of purchasing insurance (with no cash surrender value) against a disabling injury or illness that would prevent the individual from pursuing a chosen career, provided a third party (including a member institution's athletics department staff members, its professional sports counseling panel or representatives of its athletics interests) is not involved in arrangements for securing the loan. The student-athlete shall report all such transactions and shall file copies of the loan documents *and insurance policy* with the member institution. **The student-athlete also shall file copies of the insurance policy with the member institution, regardless of whether a loan is secured to purchase the insurance policy.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The NCAA Committee on Infractions recently has experienced situations where student-athletes are using collateral as opposed to a secured loan to purchase insurance against a disabling injury or illness. Under such circumstances, arguments have been made that the legislation does not require the student-athlete to file the insurance policy with the student-athlete's institution. This proposal will clarify that documentation

of any insurance policy against disabling injury or illness must be filed with the student-athlete's institution, regardless of whether a loan or collateral is used to purchase the insurance policy. It should be noted that under current legislation, an institution's professional sports counseling panel may provide direction to a student-athlete on securing a loan for the purpose of purchasing insurance against a disabling injury, provided the panel is not involved in arrangements for securing the loan.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 83 (NO. 2-54) AMATEURISM — DISABLING INJURY OR ILLNESS

Intent: To require copies of any loan documents associated with disability insurance to be filed in the office of the director of athletics, regardless of the source of the collateral for the loan.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.4.1, page 97, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.1.4.1 Exception for Insurance Against Disabling Injury or Illness. An individual may borrow against his or her future earnings potential from an established, accredited commercial lending institution exclusively for the purpose of purchasing insurance (with no cash surrender value) against a disabling injury or illness that would prevent the individual from pursuing a chosen career, provided a third party (including a member institution's athletics department staff members, its professional sports counseling panel or representatives of its athletics interests) is not involved in arrangements for securing the loan. The student-athlete shall report all such transactions and shall file copies of *the any* loan documents **associated with disability insurance regardless of the source of the collateral for the loan, and a copy of the insurance policy with the member institution in the office of the director of athletics.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.12.1.4, page 249, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.12.1.4 Disabling-Injury Insurance. A student-athlete may borrow against his or her future earnings potential from an established, accredited commercial lending institution, exclusively for the purpose of purchasing insurance (with no cash surrender value) against a disabling injury that would prevent the individual from pursuing his or her chosen career, provided a third party (including a member institution's athletics department staff members or representatives of its athletics interests) is not involved in arrangements for securing the loan. The student-athlete shall report any such transactions to the member institution and shall file copies of *the any* loan documents **associated with disability insurance regardless of the source of the collateral for the loan, and a copy of the insurance poli-**

cy in the office of the director of athletics with the member institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The process of receiving a loan to purchase premiums for disability insurance represents a significant potential for abuse and traditionally has offered agents an opportunity to confer benefits on student-athletes. Currently, NCAA regulations require copies of loan documents be filed in the athletics director's office only if the source of the collateral for the loan is the student-athlete's future earnings potential. The NCAA Committee on Infractions believes that the source of collateral for all loans should be included within this regulation, which will help to protect the institution and the involved student-athlete. The committee believes this proposal will be an effective companion piece to legislation already being sponsored by the Council related to the documentation of insurance policies. It should be noted that under current legislation, an institution's professional sports counseling panel may provide direction to a student-athlete for the purpose of purchasing insurance against a disabling injury, provided the panel is not involved in arrangements for securing the loan.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 84 (NO. 2-58) PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES — EXPENSES BEYOND 100 MILES

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive legitimate and normal expenses to participate in promotional activities related to specified competitive events in which the student-athlete has been selected to participate, regardless of the distance of the activity from the member institution's campus.

Bylaws: Amend 12.5.1.1 by adding new 12.5.1.1.1, page 102, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.5.1.1.1 Exception — Expenses Beyond 100 Miles. A student-athlete may receive legitimate and normal expenses to participate in promotional activities related to a competitive event regardless of the distance from the member institution's campus, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

"(a) The student-athlete has been selected to participate in the competition and such competition is included in 14.7.6.1 (e.g., Olympic Games, Pan American Games, World Championships, World Cup and national team tryouts and competition);

"(b) The promotional activity occurs no more than one calendar year prior to the start of the competition;

and

"(c) All conditions set forth in 12.5.1.1 [other than 12.5.1.1-(e)] are satisfied."

"[12.5.1.1.1 and 12.5.1.1.2 renumbered as 12.5.1.1.2 and 12.5.1.1.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal would provide a limited exception related to student-athletes participating in promotional activities. It would permit student-athletes to participate in promotional activities related to specified elite competitions (e.g., the Olympic Games) if the student-athlete has been selected to participate in the competition. In addition, the passage of this proposal would assist in continuing to strengthen the relationship between the NCAA and U.S. Olympic Committee.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 85 (NO. 2-60) PROFESSIONAL SPORTS
ORGANIZATIONS — SPONSORSHIP
OF YOUTH TEAMS**

Intent: To permit an individual to participate on a youth team sponsored by a professional organization without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility, provided specified conditions are met.

Bylaws: Amend 12.6.1 by adding new 12.6.1.8, page 108, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.6.1.8 Youth Teams. An individual may participate on a youth team, including a team consisting of prospects, sponsored by a professional sports team or organization without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility in that sport, provided the following conditions are met:

"(a) The youth team must otherwise be an amateur team; and

"(b) Sponsorship fees provided to the team are not earmarked for a particular individual."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Many professional teams and organizations across the country sponsor youth teams, including teams involving prospects. This practice is widespread and has existed for many years. For the most part, individuals who have participated on a team with such sponsorship have not been questioned about these arrangements and have participated for NCAA institutions in the sport. These arrangements have not diluted the integrity of the Association's amateurism legislation nor caused the Association widespread concern. This is a "common sense"

approach that will continue to ensure viability of youth athletics throughout the country.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 86 (NO. 2-110) PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES — SPOUSE/
CHILDREN OF STUDENT-ATHLETES**

Intent: To permit a Division I institution to provide the cost of actual and necessary expenses (including expenses associated with team entertainment functions) for the spouse and children of eligible student-athletes to accompany the student-athlete to any NCAA championship in which the student-athlete is a participant.

Bylaws: Amend 16.6.1 by adding new 16.6.1.2, page 241, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

"16.6.1.2 Expenses for Spouse/Children to NCAA Championship — Division I. In Division I, an institution may provide the cost of actual and necessary expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging, meals and expenses associated with team entertainment functions) for the spouse and children of an eligible student-athlete to accompany the student-athlete to any NCAA championship in which the student-athlete is a participant."

[16.6.1.2 through 16.6.1.4 renumbered as 16.6.1.3 through 16.6.1.5, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: As the Association continues to explore options for increasing benefits to student-athletes, it makes sense to permit a Division I institution, at its discretion, to provide actual and necessary expenses for the spouse and children of eligible student-athletes to accompany the student-athlete to any NCAA championship in which the student-athlete is a participant. Such a benefit should no longer be available only to football student-athletes.

Action: Adopted as amended by No. 86-1 in Division I.

**NO. 86-1 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES — SPOUSE/
CHILDREN OF STUDENT-ATHLETES**

Intent: To permit a Division I institution to provide the cost of actual and necessary expenses (including expenses associated with team entertainment functions) for the spouse and children of eligible student-athletes to accompany the student-athlete to only one round (conducted at one site) of any NCAA championship in which the student-athlete is a participant.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 86, 16.6.1.2, as follows:

[Division I only]

"16.6.1.2 Expenses for Spouse/Children to NCAA Championship — Division I. In Division I, an institution may provide the cost of actual and necessary expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging, meals and expenses associated with team entertainment functions) for the spouse and children of an eligible student-athlete to accompany the student-athlete to **one round (conducted at one site)** of any NCAA championship in which the student-athlete is a participant."

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This amendment will limit institutions to providing the cost of actual and necessary expenses for the spouse and children of eligible student-athletes to accompany the student-athlete to only one round of an NCAA championship. It addresses equity concerns caused by the varying length or number of rounds that exist among the different championships.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 87 (NO. 2-111) PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES — MEAL-ALLOWANCE LIMITATION

Intent: To permit member institutions to provide student-athletes with a meal allowance consistent with the allowance permitted on intercollegiate trips when student-athletes are required to remain on campus during a vacation period for practice or competition.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.2.3, page 244, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.2.3 Meal-Allowance Limitation. All student-athletes on the same team must receive identical meal allowances on intercollegiate trips **and during vacation periods when student-athletes are required to remain on the institution's campus for organized practice sessions or competition.** Such allowances may not exceed the amount provided by the institution to institutional staff members on *similar* **away from campus** trips."

Source: All members of the Colonial Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The maximum amount of cash allowances (in lieu of actual meals) that may be provided to student-athletes during vacation periods when they are required to remain on campus for practice or competition can be significantly lower than the cash allowance that may be provided to student-athletes when on intercollegiate trips. At many institutions the financial aid office

uses the cost of institutional meal plans to determine the amount that may be provided to student-athletes when they are required to remain on campus during a vacation period. Generally, this figure does not equate to the cost to purchase comparable meals in commercial facilities. This causes a financial hardship for student-athletes who are required to remain on campus when dining halls are closed. This proposal will allow the student-athletes to be provided with the same per diem whether they are on campus for practice or competition or on an intercollegiate trip.

Committee Position (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):

- The Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism supports this proposal. Specifically, the committee believed this was a reasonable and necessary proposal that would permit student-athletes to receive adequate meal allowances while they were required to remain on campus for practice and competition during vacation periods.
- The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 88 (NO. 2-107) FINANCIAL AID — OUTSIDE EDUCATIONAL GRANT

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive an educational grant that is awarded from an outside source solely on bases of having no relationship to athletics ability without including the value of such aid in the student-athlete's full grant-in-aid limitations.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.5.2.2, page 211, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.2.5.2.2 Outside Educational Grants. In Divisions I and II, a student-athlete may receive an outside educational grant awarded solely on bases having no relationship to athletics ability *up to the cost of attendance* **without including the value of the grant in the student-athlete's full grant-in-aid limitations,** provided."

[Remainder of 15.2.5.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: Boston College, University of Connecticut, Georgetown University, University of Miami (Florida), University of Pittsburgh, Seton Hall University, Syracuse University, Villanova University and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: It is difficult to monitor the various outside awards from organizations such as local religious, civic or nonathletics cultural organizations, particularly when the awards are in check form made out directly to the student-athlete. Many times once the outside award is discovered, the student-athlete already has

cashed the check, thereby receiving the benefits of the award that could have eligibility ramifications. In addition, these types of awards should be exempt from counting against the student-athlete's awards limitation, inasmuch as the awards have nothing to do with the student-athlete's athletics ability and are similar in nature to academic honor awards.

Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism): The committee opposes this proposal as written for the following reasons:

- The committee believes that removing the limit on such awards will lead to abuses (e.g., athletics boosters may begin to establish such grants that may be awarded primarily to student-athletes).
- The committee discussed the problems associated with tracking aid originating from outside sources and placing checks on abuses.

The committee noted, however, that it plans to continue to discuss and study this issue beginning with its September 1996 meeting in order to explore ways of permitting student-athletes to receive outside educational scholarships.

Action: Defeated in Division I; not moved in Division II.

NO. 89 (NO. 2-106) FINANCIAL AID — EXEMPTED GOVERNMENT GRANTS

Intent: To include welfare benefits received from a state or federal government among the exempted government grants set forth in 15.2.4.2.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.4.2, page 210, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.2.4.2 Exempted Government Grants. The following government grants for educational purposes shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid or cost of attendance of a student-athlete:

"(a) Welfare Benefits. Welfare benefits received from a state or federal government."

[15.2.4.2-(a) through 15.2.4.2-(g) relettered as 15.2.4.2-(b) through 15.2.4.2-(h), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: There are several types of public aid programs [e.g., Aid For Dependent Children (AFDC), cash assistance, medical assistance and food stamps] for qualified recipients who either (a) must have dependent children or (b) must meet the eligibility criteria of aged, blind or disabled. These welfare programs gen-

erally are the same in all states. Such public assistance should not be counted toward a student-athlete's maximum financial aid limit, inasmuch as such benefits are included in the computation of the student-athlete's Expected Family Contribution for financial aid packaging purposes.

Action: Adopted.

ELIGIBILITY

NO. 90 (NO. 2-93) PASS-FAIL GRADES

Intent: To permit the use of individual core courses graded on a pass/fail basis for purposes of satisfying the core-curriculum requirements, with the understanding that the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse shall assign the course the lowest passing grade at that high school, which in some instances could be a grade of "D."

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.3.6, page 169, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.3.1.3.6 Pass-Fail Grades. Courses that are awarded pass-fail grades may *not* be used to satisfy core-curriculum requirements. **The NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse shall assign the course the lowest passing grade at that high school.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The Academic Requirements Committee believes that students who complete the requirements of a core-curriculum class in which a grade is awarded on a pass-fail basis should be permitted to use such a class to meet initial-eligibility requirements. The requirement that the clearinghouse shall assign the course the lowest passing grade at that school will ensure that such courses will not be used to circumvent the minimum initial-eligibility core-curriculum grade-point standards.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I and II.

NO. 91 (NO. 2-92) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS — STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Intent: To clarify that the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee (as opposed to the high-school principal) has final authority to determine whether high-school courses for students with disabilities are core courses; further, to delete all references to the word "handicapped" in Bylaw 14.3.1.3.4.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.3.4, pages 168-169, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.3.1.3.4 Courses for the **Students With Learning-Disabled and Handicapped Disabilities**. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee may approve the use of high-school courses for the **students with learning-disabled and handicapped disabilities** to fulfill the core-curriculum requirements if the high-school principal submits a written statement to the NCAA indicating that students in such classes are expected to acquire the same knowledge, both quantitatively and qualitatively, as students in other core courses. *The learning-disabled or handicapped s***Students with disabilities** still must complete the required core courses and achieve the minimum required grade-point average in this core curriculum."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Under current legislation, high-school courses designed for students with disabilities may be considered for purposes of satisfying the initial-eligibility core-curriculum requirements only if the high-school principal provides documentation that the students are expected to acquire the same knowledge, both quantitatively and qualitatively, as students in similar courses offered by the high school. However, the Academic Requirements Committee has the ultimate authority to approve the use of such courses in satisfying the initial-eligibility core-curriculum requirements.

Action: Adopted in Division I and II.

NO. 92 (NO. 2-91) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — CORE-CURRICULUM TIME LIMITATION

Intent: To permit students with learning disabilities to use all core courses completed prior to initial full-time collegiate enrollment as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.3.1 by adding new 14.3.1.3.1.1, page 168, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.3.1.3.1.1 **Students With Learning Disabilities**. A student diagnosed with a learning disability is permitted to use all core courses completed prior to initial full-time enrollment at a collegiate institution. The determination as to whether courses taken at a high school are core courses shall be made on the basis of the 48-H confirmation statement issued to the high school where the student completed the classes. Courses taken at a collegiate institution must be approved by the Academic Requirements Committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: During meetings with the U.S. Department of Justice related to student-athletes with learning disabilities, the Association was encouraged to consider additional accommodations in evaluating whether students with learning disabilities have satisfied initial-eligibility standards. The Academic Requirements Committee believes that this is an appropriate accommodation for such students.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

NO. 93 (NO. 2-94) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — EARLY ADMISSIONS PROGRAM WAIVER

Intent: To permit a student to receive a waiver of the initial-eligibility requirements pursuant to an early admissions program, even if the student has not satisfied the core-course requirements in the area of English (i.e., lacking four years of English).

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.6, pages 169-170, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.3.1.6 Early Admissions Program Waiver. A waiver may be granted by the Academic Requirements Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program (open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise), provided the following conditions are met:

"(a) For the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained a cumulative, minimum grade-point average of 3.5000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and;

"(b) The student has **not** met *all* the requirements of a qualifier except for graduation from high school.; and

"(c) **Any remaining deficiency must be in the core-course area of English (i.e., lacking four years of English).**"

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The early admissions program waiver of the initial-eligibility requirements predates the change in the standard that requires students to successfully complete four years of English. In many instances, students who are entering an institution under an early admissions program waiver as a result of outstanding academic performance may not have completed a fourth year of English. This proposal will ensure that such students have the opportunity to qualify for a waiver of the initial-eligibility requirements and, thus, practice, compete and receive athletically related financial aid during their freshman year.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I and II.

STUDENT-ATHLETE STATEMENT — FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT

Intent: To ensure that confidential, personally identifiable information about student-athletes provided to the NCAA by member institutions is accorded the protections against public disclosure established in the Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (20 USC Section 1232g, et seq., the "Buckley Amendment").

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.3 by adding new 14.1.3.3, page 156, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.3.3 The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (20 USC Section 1232g et seq.). Personally identifiable information provided to the NCAA by an institution about a student-athlete shall be accorded the protection of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and shall not be disclosed publicly without the student-athlete's prior consent unless such disclosure would be permitted under federal law. A student-athlete shall not be required to authorize public disclosure of personally identifiable information from his or her educational records as a condition of eligibility."

Source: Appalachian State University; California State University, Fullerton; California State University, Sacramento; California State University, Stanislaus; University of Central Florida; Clemson University; Cornell University; Delaware State University; Duke University; East Carolina University; George Washington University; Georgetown University; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Illinois, Chicago; Johns Hopkins University; Loyola College of Maryland; University of Maine, Orono; University of Maryland, College Park; University of Maryland, Eastern Shore; Morehead State University; and 16 other member institutions.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Member institutions are prohibited by federal law—the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("Buckley Amendment")—from publicly disclosing personally identifiable information from a student's educational records without prior consent. Reports and correspondence sent to the NCAA pertaining to a student-athlete's eligibility constitute educational records under the Act. Federal regulation (34 CFR 99.33) also forbids redisclosure of this information by a party to whom it has been entrusted by the member institution. Such a party would be the NCAA. Sanctions for unauthorized redisclosure of personally identifiable information by the third party to whom it has been entrusted fall upon the education institution, including loss of federal money. Imminent new regulations also establish a five-year prohibition from sharing further information with the third party. Such pro-

hibition would cripple operations of the NCAA. Recently, some doubt has arisen at the NCAA national office concerning its obligations under the Act. Both as a requirement of law and as a matter of prudent practice, it is important that the national office observe the same restraints and accord student-athletes the same protections that are required of member institutions.

Committee Position (Eligibility Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 95 (NO. 2-88) ELIGIBILITY — PRACTICE OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLYMPICS

Intent: To permit a graduate student to practice with an institution's team, provided the individual's participation is recommended by the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) or the national governing body; the practice takes place only at the institution(s) the individual currently attends or previously attended as a graduate student; the participation involves an individual sport or the sport of rowing or synchronized swimming; the individual does not participate in any coaching activities; and, in the case of a student-athlete with eligibility remaining, the participation occurs during the academic year immediately preceding the Olympic Games.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.6.1.6, page 157, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.1.6.1.6 Waiver — United States Olympic Committee/National Governing Body. A student with eligibility remaining who is not enrolled or who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies or a former student-athlete may participate on a regular basis in organized practice sessions, provided the following conditions are met:

"(a) The practice sessions take place only at the institution(s) the individual previously attended as an undergraduate or currently attends or previously attended as a graduate student;"

[Remainder of 14.1.6.1.6 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal was recommended by the USOC/NCAA task force in an effort to further strengthen the relationship and increase cooperation between the USOC and the NCAA. An individual who is a potential Olympian in the specified sports also should have the opportunity to practice with the institution he or she currently attends or previously attended as a graduate student.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I, II and III.

**NO. 96 (NO. 2-100) OUTSIDE COMPETITION — DIVISION I
SOCCER AND WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL**

Intent: To permit student-athletes in the sports of men's and women's soccer and women's volleyball to compete on outside teams during the spring outside of the institution's playing and practice season as specified.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.7.1 by adding new 14.7.1.1.2, as follows:
[Division I only]

"14.7.1 Outside Competition, Sports Other Than Basketball
[14.7.1.1 unchanged.]

[14.7.1.1.1 unchanged.]

"14.7.1.1.2 Exception — Division I Soccer and Women's Volleyball. In the Division I sports of soccer and women's volleyball, a student-athlete may compete outside of the institution's declared playing and practice season as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition, provided:

- "(a) Such participation occurs no earlier than May 1;
- "(b) The number of student-athletes from any one institution does not exceed the applicable limits set forth in 17.30.2;
- "(c) The competition is approved by the institution's director of athletics;
- "(d) No class time is missed for practice activities or for competition; and
- "(e) In the sport of women's volleyball, all practice and competition is confined to doubles tournaments in outdoor volleyball, either on sand or grass."

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.18.8.1 by adding new 17.18.8.1.1.2, page 344, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.18.8.1 Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition
[17.18.8.1.1 unchanged.]

[17.18.8.1.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.18.8.1.1.2 May 1 Exception. A Division I student-athlete in the sport of soccer may compete outside of an institution's declared playing and practice season as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate amateur competition, provided:

- "(a) Such participation occurs no earlier than May 1;

- "(b) The number of student-athletes from any one institution does not exceed five;
- "(c) The competition is approved by the institution's director of athletics; and
- "(d) No class time is missed for practice activities or for competition."

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.26.17.1 by adding new 17.26.17.1.1.2, page 382, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.26.17.1 Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition

[17.26.17.1.1 unchanged.]

[17.26.17.1.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.26.17.1.1.2 May 1 Exception — Division I Women's Volleyball. A Division I student-athlete in the sport of women's volleyball may compete outside of the institution's declared playing and practice season as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition, provided:

- "(a) Such participation occurs no earlier than May 1;
- "(b) The number of student-athletes from any one institution does not exceed two;
- "(c) The competition is approved by the institution's director of athletics;
- "(d) No class time is missed for practice activities or for competition; and
- "(e) All practice and competition is confined to doubles tournaments in outdoor volleyball, either on sand or grass."

Source: University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; University of Washington; and Washington State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In the two traditional fall sports of soccer and women's volleyball, a number of late spring and early summer amateur leagues offer opportunities for competition not in conflict with an institution's nontraditional season. For those institutions that have a late-quarter-system schedule, such competition would occur during the academic year and, therefore, would be prohibited. This proposal will allow student-athletes at either semester or quarter schools an equal opportunity to participate, but with safeguards to avoid missed class time and potential injury.

Committee Position (Eligibility Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

Legislative Proposals

**NO. 97 (NO. 2-102) EXCEPTIONS TO OUTSIDE
COMPETITION — SUMMER
BASKETBALL — DIVISION II**

Intent: In Division II, to remove the restrictions on outside basketball competition that occurs during the summer.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.7.5.2, page 191, as follows:

[Division II only]

"14.7.5.2 Additional Exceptions for Basketball Only:

"(a) Summer League — Division[s] I [and II]. A student-athlete may compete during the period between June 15 and August 31 on a team in a league approved by the Council per 30.15, provided the student-athlete has received written permission from the institution's athletics director (or the director's official representative) for participation in the league. If the student-athlete is transferring and has been officially accepted for enrollment in a second institution, and if the previous institution certifies that the student has withdrawn and does not intend to return to that institution for the next term, this written permission is to be obtained from the member institution to which the student-athlete is transferring. Under such circumstances, the student-athlete does not count on the summer-league roster as a representative of either institution.

"(b) Summer Competition — Divisions II and III. There are no restrictions on the participation of Divisions II and III student-athletes in outside basketball competition during the summer."

[Remainder of 14.7.5.2 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.5.8.2, page 286, as follows:

[Division II only]

"17.5.8.2 Maximum Number of Student-Athletes on Outside Team. Following is the maximum number of student-athletes from the same member institution with eligibility remaining who may compete on an outside team:

"(a) State or national multisport events sanctioned by the NCAA — 2.

"(b) Foreign tour (outside team or all-star team) — 2.

"(c) Olympic and national team development programs and competition — No limitations.

"(d) Summer basketball team in certified league (Divisions I and II) — 1 [see 30.15-(e)].

"(e) Summer basketball team in Divisions II and III — No limit."

C. Bylaws: Amend 30.15, pages 487-488, as follows:

[Division II only]

"30.15 Summer Basketball

In order to be approved by the Council per 14.7.5.2-(a), a sum-

mer basketball league must meet the following requirements:
[30.15-(a) through 30.15-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Player Limitations

"(1) Number From Any One College. Each team shall include on its roster no more than one player with intercollegiate basketball eligibility remaining from any two-year or four-year college (other than a Divisions II and III member institutions);

"(2) Replacement of Student-Athlete Who Withdraws. A student-athlete who is listed on the roster of a team and withdraws or is injured and will not continue to practice or compete may be replaced for the remainder of the season by another basketball student-athlete from the same institution. The institution is permitted only one replacement per team; and

"(3) One Team, One League. All Division I and Division II players must limit their competition to one team in one league;"

[Remainder of 30.15 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The current restrictions on summer basketball competition prevent student-athletes from adequately working on their skills during the summer. This proposal would provide student-athletes with the flexibility to work on their skills at their discretion and provide Division II institutions relief from monitoring summer basketball competition. This proposal is consistent with current Division III legislation, as well as summer competition legislation in other sports.

Committee Position (Eligibility Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division II.

**NO. 98 (NO. 2-77) DE MINIMUS VIOLATIONS —
PROSPECTIVE AND ENROLLED
STUDENT-ATHLETES**

Intent: To specify instances in which a de minimus violation will not render a prospect or enrolled student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.7.2, page 131, as follows:

[Division III only]

"13.7.5.7.2 Division III. In Division III, meals provided for a prospect and the prospect's parents, legal guardian(s) and

spouse on an official visit must occur in any dining facility located on campus, provided the facility is open to students in general and the meal is comparable to the type of meal that the prospect would receive if he or she were to enroll as a student at that institution. If all such dining facilities are closed, the institution may provide meals off-campus. If an institution normally participates in home competition at a site that is not located on the institution's campus, the meal may occur at that site. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."**

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.1, page 135, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.1 Presence of Media During Recruiting Contact. A member institution shall not permit a media entity to be present during any recruiting contact made by an institution's coaching staff member. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."**

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.2, page 135, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.2 Comments Prior to Signing. Prior to the signing of a prospect to a National Letter of Intent or institutional tender of financial aid, a member institution may comment publicly only to the extent of confirming its recruitment of the prospect. The institution may not comment generally about the prospect's ability or the contribution that the prospect might make to the institution's team; further, the institution is precluded from commenting in any manner as to the likelihood of the prospect's signing with that institution. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."**

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.4, page 136, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.4 Prospect's Visit. A member institution shall not publicize (or arrange for publicity of) a prospect's visit to the institution's campus. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."**

E. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.5, page 136, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.5 Introduction of Prospect. An institution may not introduce a visiting prospect at a function (e.g., the institution's sports award banquet or an intercollegiate athletics contest) that is attended by media representatives or open to the general public. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an**

institutional violation per 2.8.1."

F. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.6, page 136, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.6 Intent to Enroll. A member institution shall not publicize (or arrange for publicity of) a prospect's intention to accept its offer of financial assistance. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."**

G. Bylaws: Amend 13.11.8, page 136, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.11.8 Announcement of Signing. Publicity released by an institution concerning a prospect's commitment to attend the institution shall occur only after the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. Such communications shall be limited to those media forms normally used by the institution. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."**

H. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.3.1, page 156, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.3.1 Content and Purpose. Prior to participation in intercollegiate competition each academic year, a student-athlete shall sign a statement in a form prescribed by the Council in which the student-athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status and involvement in organized gambling activities related to intercollegiate athletics competition under the Association's governing legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a student-athlete's eligibility if the violation occurred due to an institutional administrative error or oversight, and the student-athlete subsequently signs the form; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."**

I. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.4.1, page 156, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.4.1 Content and Purpose. Each academic year a student-athlete shall sign a form prescribed by the Council in which the student consents to be tested for the use of drugs prohibited by NCAA legislation. Failure to complete and sign the consent form prior to practice or competition in Divisions I and II sports in which the Association conducts year-round drug testing and prior to competition in all other sports in Divisions I, II and III shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation (i.e., practice and competition) in all intercollegiate athletics (see also 3.2.4.6). **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a stu-**

dent-athlete's eligibility if the violation occurred due to an institutional administrative error or oversight, and the student-athlete subsequently signs the form; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."

J. Bylaws: Amend 14.10.2, page 193, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.10.2 Squad-List Form. The institution's athletics director shall compile on a form approved by the Council a list of the squad members in each sport on the first day of competition and shall indicate thereon the status of each member in the designated categories. A student-athlete's name must be on the official institutional form in order for the student to be eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate athletics. **Violations of this bylaw do not affect a student-athlete's eligibility if the violation occurred due to an institutional administrative error or oversight and the student-athlete is subsequently added to the form; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is similar to the de minimus package adopted at the 1996 NCAA Convention. It takes current legislation that affects a prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility and eliminates the ineligibility component from that legislation. The proposal encompasses many instances where an institutional official fails to perform an administrative function or procedure, which renders the prospect or student-athlete ineligible, even though there is little or no recruiting or competitive advantage. Currently, violations of these provisions always result in immediate restoration of eligibility without conditions. It is important to note, however, that although violations of these provisions would have no individual eligibility ramifications, the institution still would need to self-report the violation to the enforcement staff at the NCAA national office, and the NCAA Committee on Infractions would remain responsible for assessing institutional responsibility.

Action: Part A adopted in Division III. Parts B, C, D, E, F and G adopted in Division I. Parts B, C, D, E, F G and J adopted in Divisions II and III. Parts H and I adopted. Part J adopted in Division I.

Recruiting

NO. 99 (NO. 2-61) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS — DIVISIONS I AND II FOOTBALL

Intent: In Divisions I and II football, to permit one telephone call to a prospect (or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians) during

the month of May of the prospect's junior year in high school; further, to preclude any additional telephone calls until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's senior year in high school.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.01.6, page 110, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division II football, divided vote]

"13.01.6 Time Periods for Telephone Calls and Contacts. In Divisions I and II **sports other than football**, telephone calls or in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians prior to July 1 (*August 15 in football*) following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. **In Divisions I and II football, telephone calls or in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's senior year in high school.** In Division III, in-person, off-campus contacts with a prospect or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) may not be made until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. In Divisions I and II football and basketball, such contacts are confined to specific contact periods. In all Divisions I and II sports, time periods are established during which no on- or off-campus contacts are permitted (see 30.11 and Figures 13-1 through 13-7).

"13.01.6.1 Exception — Divisions I and II Football. In Divisions I and II football, one telephone call to a prospect [or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may be made during the month of May of the prospect's junior year in high school."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.1, pages 113-114, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division II football, divided vote]

"13.1.1.1 High-School Prospects. In Divisions I and II, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. **In sports other than football, telephone calls shall not be made with a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] prior to July 1 (*August 15 in football*) following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. In Divisions I and II football, telephone calls shall not be made with a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's senior year in high school, except one telephone call may be made during the month of May of the prospect's junior year in high school.** In Division III, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) until the

prospect has completed the junior year in high school. U.S. service academy exceptions to this provision are set forth in 13.17.1."

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.1.1, page 116, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division II football, divided vote]

"13.1.3.1.1 Exception — Divisions I and II Football. In the sports of Divisions I and II football, **one telephone call to a prospect [or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may be made during the month of May of the prospect's junior year in high school. Additional** telephone calls to a prospect [or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may not be made prior to *August 15 following the completion* **September 1 of the beginning** of the prospect's *junior* **senior** year in high school; thereafter, such telephone contact is limited to once per week outside of a contact period. During a contact period, such telephone contact may be made at the institution's discretion."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Because of the limited number of early telephone contacts, it has become more important to ascertain the level of interest that a prospect has in attending the institution. The May telephone contact will allow an institution to determine a prospect's interest. Institutions will save money on mailings, additional telephone calls and recruiting trips if a prospect is not interested. The proposal also eliminates any telephone calls in August.

Action: Adopted in Division I-A; defeated in Division I-AA; defeated upon reconsideration in Division II.

**NO. 100 (NO. 2-62) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS
— DIVISION I BASKETBALL AND
FOOTBALL**

Intent: In Division I basketball and football, to establish August 1 following a prospect's junior year in high school as the first date on which the prospect may be contacted by telephone and, in Division I basketball, to permit unlimited calls to a prospect during a contact period.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.01.6, page 110, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A and Division I-AA football, divided vote]

"13.01.6 Time Periods for Telephone Calls and Contacts. In Divisions I and II, telephone calls or in-person, off-campus contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians prior to the July 1 (**August 1 in Division I football and August 15 in Division II football**) following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. In Division III, in-person, off-campus contacts with a prospect or a

prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) may not be made until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. In Divisions I and II football and basketball, such contacts are confined to specific contact periods. In all Divisions I and II sports, time periods are established during which no on- or off-campus contacts are permitted (see 30.11 and Figures 13-1 through 13-7)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.01.6, page 110, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.01.6 Time Periods for Telephone Calls and Contacts. In Divisions I and II, telephone calls or in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians prior to July 1 (**August 1 in Division I basketball and August 15 in football**) following the prospect's completing of the junior year in high school. In Division III, in-person, off-campus contacts with a prospect or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) may not be made until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. In Divisions I and II football and basketball, such contacts are confined to specific contact periods. In all Divisions I and II sports, time periods are established during which no on- or off-campus contacts are permitted (see 30.11 and Figures 13-1 through 13-7)."

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.1, pages 113-114, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A and Division I-AA Football, divided vote]

"13.1.1.1 High-School Prospects. In Divisions I and II, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. Telephone calls shall not be made with a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] prior to July 1 (**August 1 in Division I football and August 15 in Division II football**) following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. In Division III, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. U.S. service academy exceptions to this provisions are set forth in 13.1.17.1."

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.1, pages 113-114, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.1.1 High-School Prospects. In Divisions I and II, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) prior to July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. Telephone calls shall not be made with a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] prior to July 1 (**August 1 in Division I basketball and August 15 in football**) following

the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. In Division III, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. U.S. service academy exceptions to this provision are set forth in 13.17.1."

E. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.1.1, page 116, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A and Division I-AA
Football, divided vote]

"13.1.3.1.1 Exception — Divisions I and II Football. In the sports of Divisions I **football telephone calls to a prospect [or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may not be made prior to August 1 following completion of the prospect's junior year in high school. In Division II** football, telephone calls to a prospect [or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may not be made prior to August 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school; thereafter, such telephone contact is limited to once per week outside of a contact period. During a contact period, such telephone contact may be made at the institution's discretion."

F. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.1.1, page 116, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.3.1.1 Exception — Divisions I and II Football **and Division I basketball**. In the sports of Divisions I and II football, telephone calls to a prospect [or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may not be made prior to August 15 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school. **In the sport of Division I basketball, telephone calls to a prospect [or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may not be made prior to August 1 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school;** thereafter, such telephone contact is limited to once per week outside of a contact period. During a contact period, such telephone contact may be made at the institution's discretion."

Source: Eastern Kentucky University, Middle Tennessee State University, Morehead State University, Murray State University, Southeast Missouri State University, University of Tennessee at Martin, Tennessee State University and Tennessee Technological University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: There is a need during contact periods to communicate more often with prospects to arrange, verify and, in some instances, change the date for making off-campus contacts. This proposal also would standardize the rules for basketball and football for compliance purposes.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The committee believes that the ability to tele-

phone a prospect on an unlimited basis during contact periods would be disruptive to the prospect.

Action: Parts A, C and E moot in Division I-A; withdrawn in Division I-AA. Parts B, D and F withdrawn in Division I.

**NO. 101 (NO. 2-68) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS
— DIVISION I BASKETBALL**

Intent: In Division I basketball, to permit institutional staff members to make unlimited telephone calls to prospects during the period 48 hours prior to and 48 hours after the initial signing date for the National Letter of Intent.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.3.2.1, page 117, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.3.3.2.1 **Basketball and Football** Exception — Division I. Institutional staff members may make unlimited telephone calls to prospects during the period 48 hours prior to and 48 hours after 8 a.m. on the initial signing date for the National Letter of Intent."

Source: Eastern Illinois University, Eastern Kentucky University, Middle Tennessee State University, Morehead State University, Murray State University, Southeast Missouri State University, University of Tennessee at Martin, Tennessee State University and Tennessee Technological University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: There is a need for institutions to be updated on the intentions of prospects during this period so that institutions may make decisions related to offers of athletics grants-in-aid.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The committee believes the purpose of a dead period is to leave the prospect alone, and unlimited telephone calls could complicate the prospect's decision at that time.

Action: Defeated in Division I.

**NO. 102 (NO. 2-63) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS
— DIVISION I ICE HOCKEY**

Intent: In Division I ice hockey, to permit one telephone call to a prospect from a foreign country during the month of July following the prospect's sophomore year in high school.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.01.6 by adding new 13.01.6.1, page 110, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.01.6.1 **Exception — Division I Ice Hockey. In the sport of Division I ice hockey, it is permissible for an institution to make one telephone call to a prospective student-athlete who is a resident of a foreign country during the**

month of July following the completion of the prospect's sophomore year in high school."

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.3.1 by adding new 13.1.3.1.2, page 116, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.3.1.2 Exception — Division I Ice Hockey. In the sport of Division I ice hockey, it is permissible for an institution to make one telephone call to a prospective student-athlete who is a resident of a foreign country during the month of July following the completion of the prospect's sophomore year in high school."

Source: All members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: A significant number of prospects in the sport of ice hockey have alternatives to college hockey in the Canadian junior leagues and on European club teams. In recent years, representatives of the Canadian junior hockey leagues, in particular, have become notably more aggressive in the recruitment of young hockey players. As a result, prospects in the sport of ice hockey, particularly those from Canada, are being asked as early as their sophomore year in high school to make important decisions regarding their future without being able to weigh appropriate information regarding college hockey. In some cases, such decisions adversely affect their eligibility under NCAA regulations to participate in the sport at the college level. This legislation will permit NCAA hockey coaches to provide foreign prospects with information regarding the college hockey option, enabling the prospects to make a more timely and informed decision about their future.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The committee does not believe that one telephone call can make a substantial difference in the determination of whether a prospect from a foreign country attends a collegiate institution or signs with a professional league. The committee also is concerned about telephoning a prospect at such an early point in the prospect's high-school career.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

NO. 103 (NO. 2-69) RECRUITING — DIVISION I ICE HOCKEY

Intent: In Division I ice hockey, to specify that an institution has seven recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations) during the academic year and that not more than three of the seven recruiting opportunities may be in-person, off-campus contacts.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.7, page 119, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.7 Permissible Number of Contacts. In sports other than Di-

visions I-A and I-AA football, each institution shall be limited to **not more than three** in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site [which shall include contacts made with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) but shall not include contacts made during an official visit per 13.7]. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, each institution shall be limited to seven in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site [which shall include contacts made with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s), but shall not include contacts made during an official visit per 13.7]. In Division I basketball, each institution shall be limited to five recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) per prospect and not more than three of the five opportunities may be contacts. **In Division I ice hockey, each institution shall be limited to seven recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) per prospect and not more than three of the seven opportunities may be contacts."**

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.9, page 121, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.9 Limitations on Number of Evaluations — All Sports. In sports other than Division I football, and basketball and ice hockey, institutional staff members shall not evaluate a prospect on more than four occasions during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team (e.g., high-school team, all-star team, club team). In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members shall be limited to two evaluations during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team. Not more than one evaluation may be used during the fall evaluation period and not more than one evaluation may be used during the May evaluation period per Bylaw 30.11.5. In Division I basketball, each institution shall be limited to five recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) per prospect and not more than three of the five opportunities may be contacts. In Division I ice hockey, each institution shall be limited to seven recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) per prospect and not more than three of the seven opportunities may be contacts."

Source: All members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Current Division I ice hockey legislation allows for three contacts and four evaluations. This proposal increases the flexibility of recruiting without increasing the current restrictions on contacts or the overall recruiting budget. This proposal is similar in concept to the Division I basketball legislation adopted at the 1996 NCAA Convention.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal, inasmuch as the total number of contacts

and evaluations would remain the same.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

NO. 104 (NO. 2-70) RECRUITING — NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT

Intent: To permit in-person, off-campus delivery of a National Letter of Intent during a home visit.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.7.2.1, page 119, as follows:
[Division I only]

“13.1.7.2.1 Delivery of Letter-of-Intent. In-person, off-campus delivery of a letter of intent by an institutional staff member shall be prohibited **except during a visit to the prospect's home**. The letter **also** may be delivered by express mail, courier service, regular mail or facsimile machine.”

Source: Baylor University; Brigham Young University; University of Georgia; University of Memphis; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Northeast Louisiana University; University of Oklahoma; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Tech University; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; and West Virginia University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Frequently, during a home visit, a member of the coaching staff will explain a National Letter of Intent to a prospect and his/her parent(s). Current rules, however, prohibit a staff member from leaving the National Letter of Intent with the prospect and require that the document be transmitted by mail or facsimile machine. It would be more convenient and practical to permit the coaching staff member to provide the National Letter of Intent to the prospect during the home visit with the understanding it could not be executed until the appropriate time.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal. The committee believes that a staff member should be able to leave the National Letter of Intent at the prospect's home and that this is a natural progression of reviewing the National Letter of Intent with the prospect and his family. The committee also believes that little possibility for abuse exists with the proposal.

Action: Defeated in Division I.

NO. 105 (NO. 2-65) RECRUITING — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS — DIVISION I

Intent: To reinstate the definition of facsimiles or other electronically transmitted correspondence as telephone calls in Division I.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.13, page 113, as follows:
[Division I only]

“13.02.13 Telephone Calls. *In Divisions II and III,* (The definition of a telephone call includes a facsimile or other electronically transmitted correspondence, *but facsimiles and other electronically transmitted correspondence shall not be considered telephone calls in Division I.*”

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, page 124, as follows:
[Division I only]

“13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

[13.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *Electronic Transmissions — Division I. Facsimiles and electronic mail may be sent to a prospect.*”

[13.4.1-(c) through 13.4.1-(l) relettered as 13.4.1-(b) through 13.4.1-(k), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: July 1, 1997.*

Rationale: The adoption of NCAA 1996 Convention Proposal No. 105 changed the definition of facsimiles and electronic mail from telephone contact to general correspondence. Although intended to provide a more cost-efficient means to communicate with prospects, it also allows coaches to contact prospects as much as 10 months earlier (September 1 prior to the junior year rather than July 1 after completing the junior year for sports other than football) with unlimited access. As electronic mail becomes more commonplace in recruiting, the security and integrity of the information provided to prospects on an unlimited basis will become increasingly difficult to monitor. In addition, it is questionable whether unlimited electronic mail and the ability for coaches to send broadcast messages to prospects will be less intrusive than telephone calls, especially for highly recruited prospects.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal. The committee's consistent belief over the past two years is that facsimiles or other electronically transmitted correspondence should be considered telephone calls and not general correspondence.

Action: Withdrawn in Division I.

NO. 105-1 RECRUITING — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS — DIVISION I

Intent: To maintain electronic mail and facsimiles as general correspondence, but specify that such correspondence may not be sent until July 1 following the prospect's junior year in high school.

A. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 105-A, 13.02.13, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.02.13 Telephone Calls. **In Divisions II and III, the definition of a telephone call includes a facsimile or other electronically transmitted correspondence, but facsimiles and other electronically transmitted correspondence shall not be considered telephone calls in Division I.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 105-B, 13.4.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school, **unless otherwise specified in this section.** Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

[13.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) **Electronic Transmissions — Division I. Facsimiles and electronic mail may be sent to a prospect on or after July 1 following the prospect's junior year in high school.**"

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Ivy Group.

Rationale: The sponsors have expressed concern that prospects may be contacted by electronic means during their junior year in high school. This amendment prohibits contact by facsimile or electronic mail until after a prospect's junior year in high school (identical to when telephone calls are allowed); however, such electronic communications will continue to be considered general correspondence.

Action: Withdrawn

NO. 106 (NO. 2-64) RECRUITING — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS — DIVISION II

Intent: In Division II, to specify that facsimiles and electronic mail

communications are subject to restrictions on general correspondence, rather than the restrictions applicable to telephone calls.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.13, page 113, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.02.13 Telephone Calls. **In Divisions II and III, the definition of a telephone call includes a facsimile or other electronically transmitted correspondence, but facsimiles and other electronically transmitted correspondence shall not be considered telephone calls in Divisions I and II.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, pages 124-125, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

[13.4.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) **Electronic Transmissions — Divisions I and II. Facsimiles and electronic mail may be sent to a prospect.**"

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Pacific West Conference, Fort Hays State University, Longwood College, Mesa State College and Western State College of Colorado.

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Consistent with the vote and rationale of the Division I legislation adopted during the 1996 NCAA Convention, facsimiles and other electronically transmitted correspondence should not be considered telephone calls in Division II. In this age of advanced technology it is more cost-effective to use facsimiles or electronic mail to communicate with prospects than to send printed materials via mail or courier; however, these forms of communication do not replace the value of the telephone conversation for the value and types of information that can be exchanged. Electronic transmissions also do not intrude on a

prospect's time in the way telephone contacts do, which is one of the primary reasons that telephone contacts are regulated. This proposal will allow important information to be exchanged cost effectively and efficiently without counting as a telephone contact.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The committee's consistent belief over the past two years is that facsimiles or other electronically transmitted correspondence should be considered telephone calls and not general correspondence.

Action: Adopted in Division II.

NO. 107 (NO. 2-71) PRINTED RECRUITING MATERIALS — STUDENT-ATHLETE HANDBOOK — DIVISIONS I AND II

Intent: To permit an institution to send a prospect a student-athlete handbook once the prospect has either signed a National Letter of Intent or been accepted for enrollment at that institution.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, page 124, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I). Violations of the bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(j) unchanged.]

"(k) Student-Athlete Handbook. One student-athlete handbook, describing the institution's athletics department policies governing the conduct of student-athletes, may be provided to a prospect *only* during official or unofficial recruiting visits *and or* may *not* be mailed **once the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or has been accepted for enrollment by the member institution.** The handbook may contain only one color of printing throughout the publication, including the cover."

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Atlantic 10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: If a prospect does not take an official or unofficial visit, the student-athlete handbook is not available to the prospect until he or she travels to campus for enrollment. To be able to send that information upon signing or upon acceptance of enrollment would enable a prospect [and the prospect's parent(s)] to become acquainted with the institution's rules, policies and philosophies (e.g., drug and alcohol policies) earlier in the process, which would be beneficial. These handbooks often contain necessary preenrollment information, but by definition, cannot be sent. Also, the handbooks often are updated during the summer and, as permissive legislation, institutions would be permitted to send updated versions.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal. The committee believes that after signing the National Letter of Intent or being accepted for enrollment, it is reasonable to permit institutions to send handbooks to prospects.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I and II.

NO. 108 (NO. 2-74) ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS FOR OFFICIAL VISIT PRIOR TO EARLY SIGNING PERIOD

Intent: To eliminate the specific academic credentials set forth in NCAA Bylaw 13.7.1.2.4 that a student-athlete must achieve to receive an official visit prior to the early signing period for the National Letter of Intent.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.2.4, page 128, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.7.1.2.4 Academic Credentials for Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period. A Division I member institution may provide an expense-paid visit to a prospect in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of Intent prior to the initial early signing date in that sport only if the prospect has presented the institution with a minimum combined SAT score of 700 (if taken prior to April 1, 1995) or 820 (if taken on or subsequent to April 1, 1995), or PSAT score of 70 (if taken prior to April 1, 1995) or 82 (if taken on or subsequent to October 1, 1994) or a minimum sumscore of 68 on the ACT or PLAN(or PACT Plus), and also has presented a minimum 2.000 grade-point average in at least nine core courses (per 14.3.1.1). A prospect in the applicable sports who does not present these academic credentials shall not begin an official visit until 24 hours after the last day of the early signing period in that sport. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

"13.7.1.2.4.1 Academic Transcripts/Form 48-H. The institution must receive from the high school an official academic transcript and a Form 48-H in order to verify that the prospect has achieved the 2.000 grade-point average in at least nine core courses.

"13.7.1.2.4.2 Form 48-C. The use of Form 48-C is not required to certify the

prospect's eligibility to make an official visit per 13.7.1.2.4. However, the institution must utilize written documentation to verify that the prospect has met the grade-point average and core-curriculum requirements.

"13.7.1.2.4.3 Test-Score Requirement. The test score utilized by the institution must be presented in writing through an official high-school or testing agency document but is not required to be received directly from the testing agency. The test score must be achieved on a national testing date under national testing conditions. A foreign or learning-disabled prospect who requires a special administration of the PSAT, SAT, PLAN (or PACT Plus) or ACT may utilize such a score upon the approval of the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee or the Council Subcommittee on Initial-Eligibility Waivers.

"13.7.1.2.4.4 Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse. The prospect's fulfillment of these academic requirements shall be certified by an initial-eligibility clearinghouse approved by the Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee and Special Committee to Oversee Implementation of NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Information received from the Department of Justice indicates that the early official visit legislation may be particularly problematic for students with learning disabilities, especially for those who have not yet obtained "recruited" status, because no NCAA institution is available to submit a waiver petition on behalf of such students. It is arguable that the impact of 13.7.1.2.4 may be felt equally by all prospective students; thus, the committee believes that it is no longer appropriate to require separate official visit standards for those sports with early signing periods. It should be noted that the provisions of 13.7.1.2.3 will continue to apply, which permit all Divisions I and II institutions to provide expense-paid visits only to high-school or preparatory school prospects who have presented a score from a PSAT, SAT, PLAN (or PACT Plus), or ACT test from a national testing date under national testing conditions, and in Division I, if the prospect has presented the institution with a high-school (or college) academic transcript.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

NO. 109 (NO. 2-73) OFFICIAL VISIT—TRANSPORTATION

Intent: In Division I, to permit coaching staff members to accompany prospects to or from an official visit only when automobile transportation is used and to specify that if such transportation is used, the 48-hour period of the visit shall begin when the coach first makes contact with the prospect or his or her parents.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.2.2.3, page 126, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.6.2.2.3 Coach Accompanying Prospect. In Divisions I and III, except as permitted in 13.6.2.5, coaching staff members shall not

accompany a prospect to or from an official visit unless the prospect travels only by automobile. **In Division III**, all transportation must occur within the state in which the institution is located, or, if outside the state, within 100 miles of the institution's main campus. **In Division I**, if such transportation is used, the 48-hour period of the official visit shall begin when the coach first makes contact with the prospect or his or her parents. Upon completion of the 48-hour period, the coach shall terminate contact with the prospect and his or her parents immediately."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.2.1 by adding new 13.7.2.1.1, page 130, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.7.2.1.1 Coach Accompanying Prospect. **In Division I**, when a coach accompanies a prospect on an official visit by automobile, per 13.6.2.2.3, the 48-hour period shall begin when the coach first makes contact with the prospect or his or her parents. Upon completion of the 48-hour period, the coach shall terminate contact with the prospect and his or her parents immediately."

Source: All members of the Southern Conference, and University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Baylor University; Brigham Young University; University of Maryland, College Park; University of Memphis; Northeast Louisiana University; University of Oklahoma; University of Pittsburgh; University of Southern Mississippi; Texas Tech University; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; West Virginia University; and University of Wyoming.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal is intended to make the travel distance for accompanying a prospect on an official visit consistent for all Division I institutions and coaches. Presently, coaches can travel for hours in their own state, but cannot transport a prospective student-athlete on an official visit who lives within 110 miles of the institution's campus, but in a neighboring state. This proposal would permit a coach to transport a prospect on an official visit regardless of where the prospect resides. The sponsors feel it is necessary to stipulate that the official visit begins upon contact with the prospect, or his or her parents, in order to dissuade coaches from extending the 48-hour official visit time period by scheduling a lengthy visit at the prospect's home before and/or after the official visit.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

**NO. 110 (NO. 2-75) OFFICIAL VISITS — DIVISION I
FOOTBALL**

Intent: In Division I, to permit an institution to “bank” a maximum of six unused official visits annually in the sport of football, and to specify that the unused visits may be used only during the subsequent academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.6 by adding new 13.7.1.6.1, page 129, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

“13.7.1.6.1 Unused Visits — Football. In Division I football, an institution may retain a maximum of six unused visits from the previous academic year. Such visits may be used only during the subsequent academic year.”

Source: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Baylor University; Brigham Young University; University of Houston; University of Memphis; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Northeast Louisiana University; University of Oklahoma; Oklahoma State University; University of Pittsburgh; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; and University of Texas at Austin.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The number of football scholarships available in Division I to the incoming freshman class varies each year. Institutions often do not utilize their full complement of official visits, anticipating a small number of grants to be awarded for the ensuing academic year. Conversely, when the maximum number of scholarships are available, the number of official visits could be insufficient. This proposal would enable institutions to “bank” up to six unused official visits provided to prospects from the previous year (e.g., if an institution has used 50 visits in year one, it would have 62 visits available in year two). The unused visits would not carry over more than one year.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal. Due to the fluctuating numbers of initial grants-in-aid that may be awarded, the committee believes that the proposal provides necessary flexibility to an institution.

Action: Adopted in Division I-A; defeated in Division I-AA.

**NO. 111 (NO. 2-76) OFFICIAL VISITS — NATIONAL
SERVICE ACADEMIES — BASKETBALL**

Intent: For the national service academies, to permit 15 official visits in the sport of basketball, 12 of which may be provided prior to the initial National Letter of Intent signing date.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.1.6.1, page 129, as follows:

[Division I only]

“13.7.1.6.1 Exception — National Service Academies — Football and Basketball. The national service academies may provide 70 official visits in the sport of football, 56 of which may be pro-

vided prior to the initial National Letter of Intent signing date, and 15 official visits in the sport of basketball, 12 of which may be provided prior to the initial National Letter of Intent signing date.”

Source: University of Akron, Boston College, University of Cincinnati, Duke University, University of Pittsburgh, Syracuse University, U.S. Air Force Academy, U.S. Military Academy, U.S. Naval Academy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and Xavier University (Ohio).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal would restore three official visits in basketball for the national service academies. Congressional procedures require that all candidates receive a Presidential, Congressional or military nomination to be considered for admission to the service academies; and procedures also require the service academies to consider candidates from all 50 states. It is of significant importance to the welfare of prospective student-athletes that they visit the academies before deciding to attend and commit to several years of obligated service after graduation. The unique academy environment necessitates a visit so that prospects can experience, first-hand, the rigorous and disciplined military lifestyle. The service academies, in most sports, have traditionally used the maximum number of visits available, since they must pursue a far greater number of prospects to yield a comparable number of incoming freshman student-athletes. The academies do not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent, and there is no athletic financial aid awarded. This proposal is seen as critical for the national service academies to remain competitive in Division I.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal. The committee believes that the same rationale that applied to permit national service academies to provide additional visits in the sport of football also should be applicable to men’s and women’s basketball.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

**NO. 112 (NO. 2-78) UNOFFICIAL VISIT — ADMISSIONS
EVENT**

Intent: In sports other than football and men’s and women’s basketball, to permit a prospect during an unofficial visit to receive a meal as part of an “open-house” admissions department event and to have on-campus contacts with coaching staff members during the event.

Bylaws: Amend 13.8.2.1.1.1 by adding new 13.8.2.1.1.1.2, page 132, as follows:

[Division I only]

“13.8.2.1.1.1.2 Exception — Sports Other Than Football

and Basketball. In Division I sports other than football and basketball, a prospect visiting an institution's campus as part of an admissions event (i.e., open house) may be provided with one meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facility and may have contact with institutional coaching staff members only during such an event without the visit counting as an official visit. The institution must be able to certify that it is the institution's normal policy to provide such a meal to all prospects (including nonathletes) attending the admissions event."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Northeast, Metro Atlantic Athletic and Mid-Continent Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Currently, when the admissions department offers a meal to all attending students during an open-house event, and a coach makes contact with the prospects attending the open house, such contact constitutes an official visit with the prospect. Student-athletes who attend such functions are doing so at their own cost. Such admissions department open-house events are an integral part of an institution's enrollment management plan. Limiting this exception to all sports other than football and men's and women's basketball limits any potential recruiting abuse. It should be noted that Division I-AA nonscholarship cost-containment football has a similar exception permitting institutions that restrict their official visits to 25 to provide a meal to a prospect during an unofficial visit.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

NO. 113 (NO. 2-79) VISIT UNRELATED TO RECRUITMENT — NATIONAL STUDENT-ATHLETE DAY

Intent: To exempt National Student-Athlete Day activities held on an institution's campus from the limitations on providing entertainment to a prospect.

Bylaws: Amend 13.8.2 by adding new 13.8.2.6, page 133, as follows:
[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.8.2.6 Visit Related to National Student-Athlete Day. The limitations on providing entertainment to a prospect shall not extend to a visit to the institution's campus for activities related to National Student-Athlete Day."

Source: NCAA Council (Minority Opportunities and Interest Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: National Student-Athlete Day is a significant event recognizing and bringing together athletes (prospects and student-athletes) of all abilities. This proposal demonstrates the Association's commitment to encouraging athletics participation and

facilitates the promotion of issues related to student-athlete welfare.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 114 (NO. 2-80) LOCAL SPORTS CLUB — DIVISION I WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL

Intent: To preclude a member of an institution's women's volleyball coaching staff from involvement as a participant or in coaching activities in the sport of volleyball for a local sports club or organization that includes prospects.

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.4, page 138, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.12.2.4 Local Sports Clubs. In sports other than Divisions I and II basketball **and Division I women's volleyball**, an institution's coach may be involved as a participant or in instructional or coaching activities in the same sport for a local sports club or organization located in the institution's home community, provided all prospects participating in said activities are legal residents of the area (within a 50-mile radius of the institution). Further, in club teams involving multiple teams or multiple sports, the 50-mile radius is applicable only to the team with which the institution's coach is involved; however, it is not permissible for the coach to assign a prospect who lives outside the 50-mile area to another coach of the club. A coach may be involved in activities with individuals who are not of prospect age (i.e., prior to the ninth grade), regardless of where such individuals reside."

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Allowing Division I coaches to coach prospective student-athletes in club competition results in recruiting advantages gained and conflicts of interest. This prohibition would remedy those problems while allowing coaching of club players who have not yet become prospects. Division I coaches would continue to be allowed to hold administrative positions within the club structure, and to coach teams of individuals who are not of prospect age.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal. The committee believes this is an area where abuses may be occurring and noted that it will review in the future whether this legislation should be adopted for other sports.

Action: Withdrawn in Division I.

NO. 115 (NO. 2-81) TRYOUT EXCEPTION — GOLF AND TENNIS

Intent: In Divisions I and II, to permit an institution's golf and ten-

nis coaches to give private golf or tennis instruction to prospects as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.3 by adding new 13.12.3.8, pages 138-139, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.12.3.8 Private Lessons. In Divisions I and II, an institution's golf or tennis coach may teach private golf or tennis lessons to a prospect, provided the following conditions are met:

- "(a) The coach makes lessons available to the general public;**
- "(b) The prospect resides within a 100-mile radius of the institution's main campus;**
- "(c) Fees charged to the prospect are at a rate commensurate with fees charged to all individuals;**
- "(d) Prior written approval is received annually from the institution's chief executive officer;**
- "(e) Fees of the prospect are not paid by individuals or entities other than the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s); and**
- "(f) The institution keeps on file in the office of the director of athletics documentation of the fee charged for the private lessons and the name of any individual receiving any portion of the fee."**

Source: Eastern Illinois University, Eastern Kentucky University, Middle Tennessee State University, Morehead State University, Murray State University, Southeast Missouri State University, University of Tennessee at Martin, Tennessee State University and Tennessee Technological University.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal would allow institutions' golf and tennis coaches to teach prospect-age participants on a private basis without violating the tryout rule. It is anticipated that most of the participants taking lessons, including individuals who are of prospect age, probably would be beginners with no intent to play intercollegiate tennis or golf.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee opposes this proposal. The committee believes the proposal increases the opportunity for coaching staff members to develop relationships with prospects at an early age that result in recruiting advantages for that institution.

Action: Defeated in Division I; adopted in Division II.

NO. 116 (NO. 2-82) CAMPS AND CLINICS — EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTS — DIVISION II

Intent: To permit the employment of any prospect at an institution's

sports camp or clinic, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or an institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid.

Bylaws: Amend 13.13.1.5.2 by adding new 13.13.1.5.2.1, page 140, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.13.1.5.2.1 Exception — Division II. An institution may employ a prospect in a sports camp or clinic, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or an institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid."

Source: All members of the Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Currently, NCAA legislation prohibits Division II institutions from employing a prospect in an institution's camp or clinic. This proposal would allow prospects a limited, but meaningful, summer-employment opportunity without providing institutions with a recruiting advantage.

Committee Position (Recruiting Committee): The committee supports this proposal. The committee believes that in Division II, the opportunity for abuse is limited.

Action: Defeated in Division II.

Playing and Practice Seasons

NO. 117 (NO. 2-114) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISIONS I AND II GOLF

Intent: In Divisions I and II, to permit an institution that conducts its traditional segment in the sport of golf during the fall to commence practice sessions on August 24 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever occurs first; further, to permit such an institution to engage in its first date of competition in the sport of golf on September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.10, pages 262-263, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.1.10 Contest and Segment Limitations

[17.1.10.1 through 17.1.10.3 unchanged.]

"17.1.10.4 Conducting More Than 50 Percent of Schedule in Tennis or Golf During Nontraditional Segment — All Divisions I and II. A member institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall and that schedules more than 50 percent of its contests or dates of competition (including the conference championship) in the nontraditional segment may elect to utilize the preseason practice and first-date-of-compe-

tion regulations applicable to the traditional segment as set forth in **17.12.2 and 17.12.3 for golf or 17.24.2 and 17.24.3 for tennis.**

"17.1.10.5 Conducting More Than 50 Percent of Schedule in Golf and Tennis During Nontraditional Segment — Division III. A member institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall and that schedules more than 50 percent of its contests or dates of competition (including the conference championship) in the nontraditional segment may elect to utilize the preseason practice and first-date-of-competition regulations applicable to the traditional segment as set forth in 17.12.2, 17.24.2 and 17.24.3."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.2, page 314, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.12.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in golf prior to the following dates:

[17.12.2.1 unchanged.]

"17.12.2.1.1 Exception — **All Divisions III. An** Division III institution that conducts its traditional segment during the fall per 17.1.10.54 may commence practice August 24 or the first day on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first."

[17.12.2.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.12.3.1, page 314, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.12.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (meet or practice meet) with outside competition in golf prior to the following dates:

[17.12.3.1 unchanged.]

"17.12.3.1.1 Exception — **All Divisions III. An** Division III institution that conducts its traditional segment during the fall per 17.1.10.54 may play its first contest with outside competition September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday, except that exhibition scrimmages may be conducted during the preseason practice period (see 17.12.2.1)."

[17.12.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Big Sky Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: When the membership voted in January 1996 to allow a similar exemption for Divisions I and II institutions that play tennis in the fall due to weather factors, no consideration was given to institutions that play golf in the fall for the same reason. This exception would allow adequate practice time before competition begins. Institutions currently are faced with the challenge of beginning preseason practice and the first date of competition on the same date. This exception also would allow the normal number of practice opportunities prior to competition and, like tennis, moves

the first date of competition to September 1. An earlier start to the season will allow schedules to be completed before the onset of inclement weather.

Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons): The subcommittee took no position on this proposal; however, the subcommittee noted that the Council is sponsoring a deregulation proposal (recommended by the Legislative Review Committee) to establish a uniform starting date in all sports.

Action: Moot in Divisions I and II.

**NO. 118 (NO. 2-116) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS
— PRESEASON PRACTICE —
DIVISION I BASKETBALL**

Intent: To permit Division I institutions to begin on-court preseason basketball practice sessions on the Saturday nearest to October 15.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.2.1, page 280, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.5.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to **the Saturday nearest October 15 in Divisions I, and October 15 in Division II** and the fourth Saturday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(a) and 17.5.3-(b) in Division III.

[17.5.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.5.2.1.2 Prohibited Activities. Prior to **the Saturday nearest October 15 in Divisions I, and October 15 in Division II** and the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(a) and 17.5.3-(b) in Division III, members of the institution's coaching staff may not be involved with one or more team members at any location in any of the following activities:

[17.5.2.1.2-(a) through 17.5.2.1.2-(f) unchanged.]

"17.5.2.1.2.1 Exception. Team promotional activities (e.g., autograph sessions, fan picture sessions, meeting with fans) per 12.5.1 are permissible prior to **the Saturday nearest October 15 in Divisions I, and October 15 in Division II** and the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(a) and 17.5.3-(b) in Division III, provided these promotional arrangements do not involve any of the practice activities prohibited under the provisions of 17.5.2.1.2.

"17.5.2.1.2.2 Exception — Officiating Clinic. Prior to **the Saturday nearest October 15 in Divisions I, and October 15 in Division II** and the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(a)

and 17.5.3(b) in Division III, student-athletes may observe an officiating clinic related to playing rules that is conducted by video conference, provided no student-athlete misses class time to observe the clinic."

Source: All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Many Division I institutions plan promotions around the beginning of preseason basketball practice (e.g., "Midnight Madness"). These activities are least disruptive to academics when held on a weekend. By placing the beginning of practice as the Saturday nearest October 15, there will be no long-term change in the amount of basketball practice time (i.e., in some years, practice will begin shortly prior to October 15, but in other years it will begin shortly after October 15). This proposal provides better marketing and promotional opportunities for college basketball while protecting the academic interests of the student-athlete.

Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons): The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

**NO. 119 (NO. 2-118) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS
— FIRST CONTEST DATE —
DIVISION I BASKETBALL**

Intent: In Division I men's basketball, to permit the first permissible contest to be played one week earlier than currently scheduled (i.e., 136 days prior to the Division I men's basketball championship).

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3, pages 280-281, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.5.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball prior to the following dates, except as provided under 17.5.3.1:

"(a) **Division I, Men's — 136 days (including Sundays) prior to the Division I men's basketball championship game (i.e., November 14, 1997; November 13, 1998; November 19, 1999; November 17, 2000; November 16, 2001).**

"(ab) **Division I, Women's — 129 days (including Sundays) prior to the Division I men's basketball championship game (i.e., November 22, 1996; November 21, 1997; November 20, 1998; November 26, 1999; November 24, 2000; November 23, 2001).**"

[17.5.3(b) and 17.5.3(c) relettered as 17.5.3(c) and 17.5.3(d), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Colonial Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In order to create a "window" for their tournament, conference tournaments are scheduled to begin as much as 13 days before "Selection Sunday," which significantly compresses the regular-season schedule in many conferences. Coupled with schedule "blackouts" around class examinations, this "compression" forces teams to play three games per week, so that their playing schedule can be completed before the conference championship. As a result, there is more time spent away from class, more fatigue and more injuries during the latter part of the season. Since the first practice date and number of games will remain the same, this legislation will permit institutions to begin competition one week earlier without extending the total length of the playing and practice season.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

**NO. 120 (NO. 2-119) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS
— FIRST CONTEST DATE —
DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL**

Intent: In Division I women's basketball, to permit the first permissible contest to be played one week earlier than currently scheduled (i.e., 136 days prior to the Division I men's basketball championship).

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3, pages 280-281, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.5.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball prior to the following dates, except as provided under 17.5.3.1:

"(a) **Division I, Men's — 129 days (including Sundays) prior to the Division I men's basketball championship game (i.e., November 21, 1997; November 20, 1998; November 26, 1999; November 24, 2000; November 23, 2001).**

"(b) **Division I, Women's — 136 days (including Sundays) prior to the Division I men's basketball championship game (i.e., November 14, 1997; November 13, 1998; November 19, 1999; November 17, 2000; November 16, 2001).**"

[17.5.3(b) and 17.5.3(c) relettered as 17.5.3(c) and 17.5.3(d), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Atlantic Coast Conference and University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Because of the continued growth and popularity of women's basketball, many conferences hold their women's basketball championship one week earlier than their men's basketball championship. Therefore, there is less time to complete scheduled games. Many women's teams are forced to play three games per week near the end of the season so that their playing schedule will be completed before the conference championship. As a result, there is more time spent away from class, more fatigue and more injuries during the latter part of the season. Since the first practice date and number of games will remain the same, this legislation will permit women to begin competition one week earlier without extending the total length of the playing and practice season.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

**NO. 121 (NO. 2-120) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS
— FIRST CONTEST DATE —
DIVISION I BASKETBALL**

Intent: To permit the Top of the World Classic men's basketball tournaments sponsored by an active member institution located in Alaska to be played after November 8.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3.1, page 281, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.5.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted prior to the first contest dates specified under 17.5.3:

[17.5.3.1-(a) and 17.5.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) BCA Basketball Classic, Tip-Off Classic, Foreign Team in Canada, Great Alaska Shootout, **Top of the World Classic**, Maui Invitational. The following basketball games may be played after November 8 by a Division I institution during the 1996-97 academic year and after November 1 by a Division II or III institution:

[17.5.3.1-(c)-(1) through 17.5.3.1-(c)-(4) unchanged.]

"(5) For Division I members only, all games in the Great Alaska Shootout *men's* or **Top of the World Classic** basketball tournament sponsored by an active member located in Alaska; or"

[Remainder of 17.5.3.1 unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Missouri Valley Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: One of the primary intents of Bylaw 17.5.3.1-(c)-(5) is to assist those institutions with extraordinary geographic, meteorological and demographic barriers to sponsor tournaments as a means to schedule opponents. That being the case, the regula-

tion should be applied equitably to all active member institutions in Alaska. The University of Alaska Fairbanks has initiated the "Top of the World Classic" for much the same reason as the University of Alaska Anchorage conducts the Great Alaska Shootout, primarily as a tool to enhance the ability to attract and maintain a competitive schedule. In order for the "Top of the World Classic" and any future tournaments to be viable in the long term, they need every available opportunity for success. Alaskan institutions already have many obstacles to overcome based primarily on their location. The added constraints of conference and venue scheduling, a small market, and difficult demographic and meteorological conditions caused by location make it untenable to conduct tournaments during other time periods. In addition, Alaska Fairbanks is much more isolated than Alaska Anchorage or member institutions in Hawaii. With the exception of Alaska Anchorage, the nearest Alaska Fairbanks potential opponent is more than 1,500 miles away. On the other hand, Hawaii has several Divisions I and II institutions. If there is any institution that needs this type of exemption, it is Alaska Fairbanks. It is literally almost at the very end of the road.

Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons): The subcommittee supports this proposal only if the sponsors agreed to amend the proposal to make it specific to the "Top of the World" Classic. The sponsors have modified the proposal consistent with the subcommittee's recommendation.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

**NO. 122 (NO. 2-115) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS
— ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS —
BASEBALL, FIELD HOCKEY, ICE
HOCKEY, LACROSSE, SOCCER AND
SOFTBALL**

Intent: In the sports of baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer and softball, to permit Division I institutions to exempt annually one season-ending tournament (that does not require certification) from the maximum number of contests/dates of competition; further, in the sport of ice hockey, to permit institutions in all divisions to exempt annually one season-ending tournament (that does not require certification) from the maximum number of contests.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.4.5.3, pages 276-277, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.4.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of baseball contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-6):

[17.4.5.3-(a) and 17.4.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Season-Ending Tournaments.

"(1) *NCAA Championship — Division I. Competition in an NCAA baseball championship;*

"(2) *NAIA Championship — Division I. Competition in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) baseball championship;*

"(3) *Season-Ending Tournament — Divisions II and III. Competition in one season-ending baseball tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;"*

[Remainder of 17.4.5.3 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.5.3, pages 303-305, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.10.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of contests or dates of competition in the sport of field hockey shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-12):

[17.10.5.3-(a) and 17.10.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Season-Ending Tournaments.

"(1) *NCAA Championship — Division I. Competition in an NCAA field hockey championship;*

"(2) *Season-Ending Tournament — Divisions II and III. Competition in one season-ending field hockey tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season;"*

[Remainder of 17.10.5.3 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5.3, pages 325-327, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.14.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of ice hockey contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-17):

[17.14.5.3-(a) and 17.14.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) *NCAA Championship **Season-Ending Tournament.** Competition in an NCAA **one season-ending** ice hockey tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;"*

[Remainder of 17.14.5.3 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.15.5.2, page 330, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.15.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of lacrosse shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-18):

[17.15.5.2-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Season-Ending Tournaments.

"(1) *NCAA Championship. Competition in an NCAA lacrosse championship;*

"(2) *Season-Ending Tournament — Divisions II and III: Competition in one season-ending lacrosse tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season;"*

[Remainder of 17.15.5.2 unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.18.5.2, pages 341-343, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.18.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of soccer contests and dates of competition shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-21):

[17.18.5.2-(a) and 17.18.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Season-Ending Tournaments.

"(1) *NCAA Championship — Division I. Competition in an NCAA soccer championship;*

"(2) *NAIA Championship. Competition in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) soccer championships;*

"(3) *Season-Ending Tournament — Divisions II and III: Competition in one season-ending soccer tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season;"*

[Remainder of 17.18.5.2 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.5.3.2, pages 346-347, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.19.5.3.2 Certification Not Required — Division I. The following softball contests each year may be exempted from a Division I institution's maximum number of contests:

[17.19.5.3.2-(a) and 17.19.5.3.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Season-Ending Tournament.

"(1) *NCAA Championship. Competition in an NCAA **one season-ending** softball tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship). A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of the regular season;*

"(2) *NAIA Championship. Competition in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) softball championships;"*

[Remainder of 17.19.5.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Section C only) and all members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The adoption of 1996 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 73 allowed Divisions II and III institutions to annually exempt a season-ending tournament in the team sports of baseball, basketball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and volleyball. Adopting similar legislation for these Division I team sports is consistent with the on-going policy of the Association toward simplifying the NCAA Manual. Further, the sport of ice hockey was inadvertently omitted among the team sports listed in Proposal No. 73. Passage of this proposal will make consistent all team-sport legislation as it relates to the application of a season-ending tournament exception.

Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons): The subcommittee took no position on this proposal but suggested that additional feedback be obtained from the Special Events Committee in light of the contest-exemption legislation adopted at the 1996 Convention. The Special Events Committee expressed opposition to this proposal. The committee believes the proposal conflicts with the purpose of the contest-exemption legislation that was adopted at the 1996 Convention.

Action: Parts A, B, D, E and F not moved in Division I. Part C not moved in Division I; adopted in Divisions II and III.

NO. 123 (NO. 2-121) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION II BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit Division II institutions to exempt annually not more than two informal practice scrimmages from the maximum number of permissible contests as specified.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.5.3.1, pages 280-281, as follows:

[Division II only]

"17.5.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games and scrimmages) are permitted prior to the first contest dates specified under 17.5.3:

"(a) Practice Scrimmages — Divisions I and II. Informal practice scrimmages with outside competition, provided they are conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring and provided they are counted against the maximum permissible number of contests;

"(b) Practice Scrimmages — Division II. A maximum of two informal practice scrimmages with outside competition in basketball (conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring) may be conducted between November 1 and the conclusion of the basketball season, provided the institution does not utilize an exemption set forth in 17.5.5.2.3-(d) or 17.5.5.2.3-(e). If an institution utilizes one exemption set forth in ei-

ther 17.5.5.2.3-(d) or 17.5.5.2.3-(e), it may not exempt more than one informal scrimmage;"

[17.5.3.1-(b) through 17.5.3.1-(f) relettered as 17.5.3.1-(c) through 17.5.3.1-(g), unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.5.5.2.3, page 283, as follows:

[Division II only]

"17.5.5.2.3 Division II. The following basketball contests each year may be exempted from a Division II institution's maximum number of contests:

[17.5.5.2.3-(a) through 17.5.5.2.3-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Practice Scrimmages. A maximum of two informal practice scrimmages with outside competition in basketball may be conducted between November 1 and the conclusion of the basketball season, provided the institution does not utilize an exemption set forth in 17.5.5.2.3-(d) or 17.5.5.2.3-(e). If an institution utilizes one exemption set forth in either 17.5.5.2.3-(d) or 17.5.5.2.3-(e), it may not exempt more than one informal scrimmage."

Source: All members of the Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Current NCAA legislation permits Division II institutions to exempt two exhibition games from its basketball contest limitations, one against a foreign team and one against a certified AAU team. Very few Division II institutions have the budget to schedule legitimate exhibitions against bona fide foreign and AAU teams. This proposal would be much more economical for such institutions and would provide competitive opportunities for all institutions, regardless of geography. This would allow institutions to play quality games in November to prepare for the season and would be consistent with current Division III legislation.

Action: Adopted in Division II.

NO. 124 (NO. 2-124) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION II FOOTBALL — PIONEER BOWL

Intent: To permit the champions of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference to participate in the Pioneer Bowl and to exempt such participation from the limitations governing the end of the playing season and the permissible number of contests; further, to mandate that the Pioneer Bowl shall be conducted not earlier than one week after the conclusion of the NCAA Division II Football Championship.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.4, pages 309-310, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"17.11.4 End of Playing Season. A member institution's last contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football

shall not be played outside the traditional segment (Division III) or after the second Saturday or Sunday in December (Divisions I and II), except for the following:

[17.11.4-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, International Competition, and Heritage Bowl and Pioneer Bowl. One postseason game approved by the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; football contests played on a foreign tour certified by the member institution, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships. In Division I-AA only, a member institution’s last contest also may include participation in the Heritage Bowl to be held between representatives of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference no earlier than the Monday after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship. **In Division II only, a member institution’s last contest also may include participation in the Pioneer Bowl to be held between representatives of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference no earlier than one week after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division II Football Championship.**

[17.11.4.1 and 14.11.4.2 unchanged.]

“**17.11.4.3 Pioneer Bowl Restrictions.** All members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference shall participate in the Division II Football Championship, if eligible and selected for participation, and members of those conferences that participate in the Division II Football Championship also shall not participate in the Pioneer Bowl during the same year.”

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.11.5.2, pages 310-312, as follows:

[Division II only]

“17.11.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-14):

[17.11.5.2-(a) through 17.11.5.2-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) **Pioneer Bowl. Participation in the Pioneer Bowl, held between representatives of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.**”

[17.11.5.2-(d) through 17.11.5.2-(q) relettered as 17.11.5.2-(e) through 17.11.5.2-(r), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This legislation would afford a representative from the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and a representative from the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference to participate in a postseason bowl. All members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference will continue to participate in the NCAA Division II Football Championship, if eligible and selected for participation.

Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons): The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Part A adopted in Division II. Part B adopted in Division II.

NO. 125 (NO. 2-126) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — SPRING PRACTICE — DIVISIONS I AND II FOOTBALL

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal in Divisions I-A and I-AA.]

Intent: In Divisions I and II football, to specify that no contact shall occur during the first two spring football practice sessions, to reduce the number of practice sessions that may involve contact from 10 to five and to preclude the use of shoulder pads during all noncontact practice sessions.

Bylaws: Amend 17.11.6, pages 312-313, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division II football, divided vote]

“17.11.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-season practice in football is prohibited, except for the following:

“(a) Spring Practice — Division I. In Division I, 15 postseason practice sessions [including intrasquad scrimmages and the spring game permitted in 17.11.5.2-(a)] are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution’s calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 5 of the 15 sessions may involve contact **and such contact shall not occur prior to the third practice session.** An institution has the discretion to determine the practice activities that may occur during noncontact sessions (e.g., use of blocking dummies), provided no football gear or protective equipment other than head gear, *shoulder pads*, shoes, pants, and porous lightweight jerseys are worn by the involved student-athletes. The amount of time that a student-athlete may be involved in such postseason countable athletically related ac-

tivities shall be limited to a maximum of 20 hours per week;

- (b) Spring Practice — Division II. In Division II, 15 postseason practice sessions [including intrasquad scrimmages and the spring game permitted in 17.11.5.2-(a)] are permissible, provided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 5 of the 15 sessions may involve contact **and such contact shall not occur prior to the third practice session.** An institution has the discretion to determine the practice activities that may occur during non-contact sessions (e.g., used of blocking dummies), provided no football gear or protective equipment other than head gear, *shoulder pads*, shoes, pants and porous lightweight jerseys are worn by the involved student-athletes. A student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities (see 17.02.1.1) during the spring practice period shall be limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week;"

[Remainder of 17.11.6 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In any sport, student-athletes should not be exposed to an out-of-season injury risk that is higher than experienced during regular season. The NCAA Injury Surveillance System (ISS) shows an overall spring football injury rate more than double that of fall football practice. Severe injury rates (concussions, required surgery, anterior cruciate ligament) are two to three times higher in the spring; over 80 percent of them occur in contact practices. In the spring of 1991, in Division I, reducing the number of spring football contact days from 15 to 10 resulted in an immediate reduction in the spring football injury rate. A similar effect is anticipated with this proposal. Requiring two initial non-contact days allows student-athletes to become acclimated to the activity and is consistent with existing fall practice legislation. The addition of shoulder pads to designated noncontact practices has not decreased shoulder injuries in such practices, has resulted in an increase in contact and interferes with heat acclimation. The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports strongly believes that the difference in the regular and out-of-season football practice injury rates is real, significant and preventable, and that the current spring football practice legislation should be modified.

Action: Referred to Championships/Competition Cabinet in Divisions I-A and I-AA; referred to Division II Management Council in Division II.

NO. 126 (NO. 2-127) MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION — WOMEN'S LACROSSE — DIVISION I

Intent: In Division I, to permit member institutions in the sport of women's lacrosse to engage in 17 dates of competition during the traditional segment and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment.

Bylaw: Amend 17.15.5.1, pages 329-330, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.15.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. In all divisions, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of lacrosse during the institution's lacrosse playing season to 17 dates of competition **in men's lacrosse and Divisions II and III women's lacrosse, and 17 dates of competition during the traditional segment and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment in Division I women's lacrosse**, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.15.5.2, 17.15.5.3, 17.15.5.4, 17.15.5.5, 17.15.5.6 and 17.15.5.7.

[17.15.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.15.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 17 dates of competition **in men's lacrosse and Divisions II and III women's lacrosse, and 17 dates of competition during the traditional segment and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment in Division I women's lacrosse.** This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

Source: All members of the Colonial Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal would allow institutions to provide the same participation opportunities during the nontraditional segment in women's lacrosse that currently apply in the sports of field hockey and soccer.

Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons): The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

**NO. 127 (NO. 2-129) MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION
— WRESTLING — DIVISION III**

Intent: In Division III wrestling, to specify that not more than two, two-day meets shall count as a single date of competition.

Bylaws: Amend 17.28.5, page 388, as follows:
[Division III only]

"17.28.5 Number of Dates of Competition

"17.28.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of wrestling during the permissible wrestling playing season to 16 dates of competition, which, in *Divisions I and II*, may include not more than two, two-day meets that shall each count as a single date of competition each, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.28.5.2, 17.28.5.3 and 17.28.5.4.

[17.28.5.1.1 unchanged.]

"17.28.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 16 dates of competition in wrestling, which, in *Divisions I and II*, may include not more than two, two-day meets that shall each count as a single date of competition each. This limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

Source: All members of the Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal would make the dates-of-competition legislation consistent among all divisions.

Action: Adopted in Division III.

**NO. 128 (NO. 2-128) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS
— OUTSIDE TEAMS — WATER POLO**

Intent: To permit student-athletes in the sport of water polo to be involved on an outside water polo team that includes the student-athletes' coaches during the summer months.

Bylaws: Amend 17.27.7.1.3.1, page 386, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.27.7.1.3.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff. No member of the coaching staff of a member institution may be involved in any capacity (e.g., coach, official, player or league/team administrator) **during the academic year** at any time (i.e., during the academic year, including vacation periods **during the academic year** and summer) with an outside team that involves any student-ath-

lete with eligibility remaining from the institution's water polo team except as provided under 14.7.6 and 17.30."

Source: University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Irvine; University of California, Santa Barbara; California State University, Long Beach; Lehman College; Queens College (New York); San Diego State University; Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania; U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; and U.S. Naval Academy.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Water polo and other facility-constrained sports do not have the same advantages as sports such as basketball, where numerous opportunities are available for coaches and athletes during the summer months. Due to the scarcity of facilities and the sport's geographic concentration, water polo coaches often must choose between coaching a water polo team during the summer or permitting their local athletes to participate on such teams. In some cities, there is only one local club and one varsity team. If the institution's coach works with the local club, no student-athlete from the coach's team may play for the club, effectively eliminating the student-athlete's opportunity to train during the summer. On the other hand, if the student-athlete chooses to play for the club, the coach is prevented from working and earning a wage that may be vital to the institution's ability to retain the coach's part-time services. In many instances, this removes the only available coach and facility, eventually ending the club's existence and the student-athlete's opportunities. This further reduces the growth potential for water polo in geographic areas with low participation and places an undue hardship on both the student-athlete and the coach. At a time when water polo needs legislative assistance to help increase its numbers, the current legislation makes this growth more difficult.

Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Season): The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I, II and III.

**NO. 129 (NO. 2-139) RESOLUTION: DIVISION I
BASEBALL AND SOFTBALL**

[Division I only]

"Whereas, Division I baseball and softball are sponsored by a super majority of the membership, thus, identifying them as sports in which the division has invested its resources; and

"Whereas, inclement weather prevails in the early spring in the northern half of the United States; and

"Whereas, the cancellation and rescheduling of games due to inclement weather results in a compacted schedule that creates a significant academic impact for student-athletes; and

"Whereas, institutions in inclement weather environments are

forced to play at warm-weather sites in order to play a complete schedule and prepare for conference competition, further impacting academics and finances;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that an NCAA special committee representative of academic, competitive and financial concerns be created to explore the possibility of redefining the competitive seasons for baseball and softball by moving the NCAA championships for these sports to late June; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the NCAA special committee be charged with the preparation of legislative proposals within one year of the adoption of this resolution to move the baseball and softball traditional seasons for consideration by the representative Division I governance bodies."

Source: All members of the Big Ten Conference.

Action: Referred to Championships/Competition Cabinet in Division I.

Personnel

NO. 130 (NO. 2-47) ETHICAL CONDUCT — GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Intent: To prohibit athletics administrators (including coaching staff members) from participating in any gambling activities associated with professional sports contests.

Bylaws: Amend 10.3, pages 77-78, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"10.3 GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution and student-athletes shall not knowingly:

[10.3-(a) through 10.3-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Participate in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics (and for student-athletes only, or professional athletics), through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: It is inconsistent to prohibit student-athletes from wagering on professional sports contests without a similar policy for athletics administrators.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 131 (NO. 2-49) ATHLETICALLY RELATED INCOME — EQUIPMENT AND APPAREL CONTRACTS

[Note: The NCAA Council has indicated its intent to withdraw sponsorship of this proposal.]

Intent: To require contracts for athletics equipment and apparel to be between the institution and vendor, or a tripartite arrangement between the institution, athletics department staff member and vendor.

Bylaws: Amend 11.2.2 by adding new 11.2.2.2, page 82, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.2.2 Athletically Related Income. Contractual agreements, including letters of appointment, between a full-time or part-time athletics department staff member (excluding secretarial or clerical personnel) and an institution shall include the stipulation that the staff member is required to receive annually prior written approval from the chief executive officer for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution. The staff member's request for approval also shall be in writing and shall include the amount and the source of the income. Sources of such income shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

[11.2.2-(a) through 11.2.2-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) Endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers (see 11.2.2.2).

[11.2.2.1 unchanged.]

"11.2.2.2 Equipment and Apparel Contracts. All contracts for athletics equipment and apparel shall be either between the institution and vendor, or a tripartite arrangement between the institution, athletics department staff member and vendor. The institution must be a party to any agreements entered into on or after September 23, 1996."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Big Ten Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Rationale: This proposal is designed to place the institution in a position to both benefit from and control the negotiation process with an equipment or apparel vendor. Although institutions benefit indirectly from agreements between coaches and vendors via free or discounted goods, the primary monetary benefit is realized by the coach/departments staff member. These payments contribute to the student-athletes' perception that coaches are able to derive inordinate benefits as a result of a team's success, thus fueling the argument that student-athletes should benefit from this arrangement by receiving pay. Placing the responsibility of contracts with equipment or apparel vendors in the hands of the institution gives the institution flexibility and leverage to control compensation and the distribution of benefits to coaches.

Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Personnel Limitations): The subcommittee took no position on this proposal; however, the subcommittee expressed concern that the proposal includes language to indicate that an institution must be a part of all equipment or apparel contracts entered into on or after September 23, 1996, which appears to put the proposal into effect almost a year prior to its effective date. The sponsors have modified the proposal to move the effective date from August 1, 1997, to immediately.

Action: Referred to Business/Finance Cabinet in Division I.

NO. 132 (NO. 2-50) CONDUCT AND EMPLOYMENT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL

Intent: To preclude the use of quotations from or pictures of an institution's coaching staff member in noninstitutional camp or clinic brochures, unless the coaching staff member is employed by the camp or clinic.

Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2 by adding new 11.3.2.11, page 84, as follows:
[Division I only]

"11.3.2.11 Quotations and Pictures Used to Promote a Camp. In Division I, an institution's coaching staff member may not promote a noninstitutional camp or clinic by permitting the use of his or her quotations and/or pictures in the camp or clinic brochure, unless that coaching staff member is employed by the camp."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Current legislation allows private, noninstitutional summer camps to use quotations from and pictures of coaching staff members from various member institutions to promote the camp, provided the coaches or their institutions do not buy or arrange to have space in the camp brochure and the brochure does not contain information concerning athletics participation, evaluation of prospects or other material designed to solicit the enrollment of prospects. In order to minimize any potential recruiting advantage and preserve equity in the recruitment of prospects, coaching staff members should be precluded from any involvement in the promotion of a private, noninstitutional camp or clinic, unless the coaching staff member is employed by the camp.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

NO. 133 (NO. 2-51) SCOUTING OF OPPONENTS — DIVISION I WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL

Intent: To prohibit off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents in

A-212

Legislative Proposals

the sport of Division I women's volleyball.

Bylaws: Amend 11.6.1, page 86, as follows:
[Division I only]

"11.6.1 Division I

"11.6.1.1 Basketball, and Football and Women's Volleyball Prohibition. In Division I basketball, and football and women's volleyball, off-campus, in-person scouting of opponents is prohibited, except as provided in 11.6.1.1.1.

[11.6.1.1.1 unchanged.]

"11.6.1.2 Sports Other Than Basketball, and Football and Women's Volleyball. In sports other than basketball, and football and women's volleyball, a Division I member institution shall not pay or permit the payment of expenses incurred by its athletics department staff members or representatives (including professional scouting services) to scout its opponents or individuals who represent its opponents, except as provided in 11.6.1.2.1 in lacrosse and women's volleyball.

"11.6.1.2.1 Lacrosse and Women's Volleyball. In lacrosse and women's volleyball, it shall be permissible for an institution to pay the expenses of one person to scout each opponent on one occasion. When an individual is being reimbursed to travel by automobile to scout an opponent, others who travel with the individual in the same vehicle to the site are not considered to be receiving transportation expenses. Any coach can scout opponents at his or her own expense.

[11.6.1.2.1.1 through 11.6.1.2.1.3 unchanged.]

[11.6.1.3 and 11.6.1.4 unchanged.]

"11.6.1.4.1 Lacrosse and Women's Volleyball. In lacrosse and women's volleyball, receipt of press-box tickets or complimentary tickets from an opponent shall constitute a countable scouting opportunity."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Big West Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Scouting of opponents in the sport of women's volleyball is a costly activity for institutions situated in nonmetropolitan areas. Prohibiting the scouting of opponents in women's volleyball will not only result in significant cost savings for most institutions, but it also will create a level playing field for all institutions. As is happening in the sports of football and basketball which currently have a prohibition against off-campus scouting of opponents, scouting of women's volleyball opponents may occur only through videotape exchange.

Action: Adopted in Division I.

Legislative Proposals

A-213

NO. 134 (NO. 2-48) CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS
PERSONNEL — TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Intent: To establish uniform penalties in all sports for game personnel (e.g., coaches, trainers, managers and game officials) who use tobacco products during practice or competition.

Bylaws: Amend 11.1.7, page 82, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"11.1.7 Use of Tobacco Products. The use of tobacco products is prohibited by all game personnel (e.g., coaches, trainers, managers and game officials) in all sports during practice and competition. **Uniform penalties (as determined by the applicable sports committee) shall be established for such use.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Committee of Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Under current legislation, a double standard exists as it relates to the use of tobacco by student-athletes and game personnel during practice and competition. Student-athletes are penalized for violating the tobacco ban; however, under the Association's rules, no penalty is imposed on game personnel. Further, results of conference surveys show that only 50 percent of the conferences have penalties in place for game personnel who violate the tobacco ban. This proposal will address the inconsistency that currently exists by requiring the imposition of uniform, practical penalties as determined by the applicable sports committees.

Action: Adopted.

General

NO. 135 (NO. 2-84) POSITIVE DRUG TEST — NON-NCAA
ATHLETICS ORGANIZATION

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

Intent: To authorize NCAA testing of student-athletes who test positive for banned substances by a non-NCAA athletics organization.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.1.3, page 156, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.1.3 Student-Athlete Statement

"14.1.3.1 Prior to participation in intercollegiate competition each academic year, a student-athlete shall sign a statement

in a form prescribed by the Council in which the student athlete submits information related to eligibility, recruitment, financial aid, amateur status, **previous positive drug tests administered by any other athletics organization** and involvement in organized gambling activities related to intercollegiate athletics competition under the Association's governing legislation. Failure to complete and sign the statement shall result in the student-athlete's ineligibility for participation in all intercollegiate competition.

[14.1.3.2 unchanged.]

"14.1.3.3 Institutional Responsibility — Notification of Positive Test. The institution shall promptly notify in writing the NCAA's director of sports sciences regarding a student-athlete's disclosure of a previous positive test for banned substances administered by any other athletics organization."

B. Bylaws: Amend 18.4.1.5, page 399, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

[18.4.1.5 unchanged.]

"18.4.1.5.1 Duration of Ineligibility. A student-athlete who tests positive (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one season of competition in all sports if the season of competition has not yet begun for that student-athlete or a minimum of the equivalent of one full season of competition in all sports if the student-athlete tests positive during his or her season of competition (i.e., the remainder of contests in the current season and contests in the subsequent season up to the period of time in which the student-athlete was declared ineligible during the previous year). The student-athlete shall remain ineligible for all regular-season and postseason competition during the time period ending one calendar year (i.e., 365 days) after the student-athlete's positive drug test, and until the student-athlete retests negative (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) and the student-athlete's eligibility is restored by the Eligibility Committee. If the student-athlete tests positive a second time for the use of any drug, other than a 'street drug' as defined in 31.2.3.1, he or she shall lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of a 'street drug' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one additional season of competition in all sports and also shall remain ineligible for regular-season and postseason competition at least through the next calendar year. **In addition, a student-athlete who has previously tested positive for performance-enhancing drugs administered by any other athletics organization and subsequently tests**

positive (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) shall be subject to these ineligibility provisions.

[18.4.1.5.2 unchanged.]

"18.4.1.5.3 Non-NCAA Athletics Organization's Positive Drug Test. The Executive Committee shall authorize methods for drug testing any student-athlete who has disclosed in the student-athlete statement (see 14.1.3.1) that he or she has a positive drug test administered by a non-NCAA athletics organization."

C. Bylaws: Amend 30.12, page 484, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"30.12 STUDENT-ATHLETE STATEMENT

"The following procedures shall be used in administering the student-athlete statement required in 14.1.3:

[30.12-(a) through 30.12-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) The athletics director shall promptly notify in writing the NCAA's director of sports sciences regarding a student-athlete's disclosure of a previous positive drug test administered by any other athletics organization."

D. Bylaws: Amend 31.2.3, pages 496-498, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"31.2.3 Ineligibility for Use of Banned Drugs. Bylaw 18.4.1.5 provides that a student-athlete who is found to have utilized a substance on the list of banned drugs shall be declared ineligible for further participation in postseason and regular-season competition during the time period ending one calendar year after the student-athlete's positive drug test, and shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one season of competition in all sports if the season of competition has not yet begun for that student-athlete or a minimum of the equivalent of one full season of competition in all sports if the student-athlete tests positive during his or her season of competition (i.e., the remainder of contests in the current season and contests in the subsequent season up to the period of time in which the student-athlete was declared ineligible during the previous year). The student-athlete shall remain eligible until the student-athlete retests negative (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) and the student-athlete's eligibility is restored by the Eligibility Committee. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of any drug, other than a 'street drug' as defined below, after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of a 'street drug' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall lose a minimum of one additional season of competition in all sports and also shall remain ineligible for regular-season and postsea-

son competition at least through the next calendar year. Bylaw 18.4.1.5 also provides that the Executive Committee shall adopt a list of banned drugs and authorize methods for drug testing of student-athletes on a year-round basis. **In addition, as stated in Bylaw 18.4.1.5.1, a student-athlete who previously tested positive for performance-enhancing drugs administered by any other athletics organization and subsequently tests positive (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) shall be subject to these ineligibility provisions.**

[31.2.3.1 unchanged.]

[31.2.3.1.1 unchanged.]

"31.2.3.1.2 Positive Drug Test — Non-NCAA Athletics Organization. A student-athlete who has disclosed (i.e., in the student-athlete statement) a previous positive drug test for performance enhancing drugs administered by any other athletics organization (e.g., U.S. Olympic Committee) shall be required to submit to a drug test administered by the NCAA for the banned drugs listed in Bylaw 31.2.3.1. A student-athlete who is tested by the NCAA and found to have utilized a substance on the NCAA's list of banned drugs shall be declared ineligible for further participation in postseason and regular-season competition in accordance with the ineligibility provisions in Bylaws 31.2.3 and 18.4.1.5."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: This proposal will address concerns expressed by many coaches' groups that student-athletes who have tested positive for banned substances by other non-NCAA organizations (e.g., U.S. Olympic Committee, U.S. Swimming, U.S.A. Track & Field) continue to be eligible to compete in NCAA championship events.

Action: Part A adopted. Part B adopted in Divisions I, II and III. Parts C and D adopted.

NO. 136 (NO. 2-66) TRANSFER — POSITIVE DRUG TEST

Intent: To indicate that when a student-athlete who is declared ineligible due to a positive drug test transfers to another NCAA institution, the institution from which the student-athlete transferred must notify the new institution of the student-athlete's ineligibility.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.3 by adding new 13.1.1.3.4, page 114, as

follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.1.1.3.4 Transfer While Ineligible Due to Positive Drug Test. If a student-athlete who is declared ineligible due to a positive drug test wishes to transfer to another NCAA institution, the institution from which the student-athlete transferred must notify the new institution of the student-athlete's ineligibility (see 18.4.1.5.1)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 18.4.1.5.1, page 399, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"18.4.1.5.1 Duration of Ineligibility. A student-athlete who tests positive (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one season of competition in all sports if the season of competition has not yet begun for that student-athlete or a minimum of the equivalent of one full season of competition in all sports if the student-athlete tests positive during his or her season of competition (i.e., the remainder of contests in the current season and contests in the subsequent season up to the period of time in which the student-athlete was declared ineligible during the previous year). The student-athlete shall remain ineligible for all regular-season and postseason competition during the time period ending one calendar year (i.e., 365 days) after the student-athlete's positive drug test, and until the student-athlete retests negative (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) and the student-athlete's eligibility is restored by the Eligibility Committee. **If the student-athlete transfers to another NCAA institution while ineligible, the institution from which the student-athlete transferred must notify the new institution that the student-athlete is ineligible.** If the student-athlete tests positive a second time for the use of any drug, other than a 'street drug' as defined in 31.2.3.1, he or she shall lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of a 'street drug' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one additional season of competition in all sports and also shall remain ineligible for regular-season and postseason competition at least through the next calendar year."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Some student-athletes who are declared ineligible due to a positive drug test transfer to another NCAA institution in an effort to avoid the required loss of eligibility. This proposal will help protect institutions from the negative consequences that can result from using an ineligible player. It should be noted that due to the federal Buckley Amendment, the previous institution may be limited to disclosing only that the student-athlete

is ineligible and not that he or she is ineligible due to a positive test, unless consent is received from the student-athlete to disclose the positive drug test.

Action: Adopted upon reconsideration in Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 137 (NO. 2-131) CHAMPIONSHIPS — MINIMUM SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA — OLYMPIC SPORTS

Intent: To create a protected status to continue all men's and women's NCAA championships in Olympic sports.

Bylaws: Amend 18.2.10 by adding new 18.2.10.3, page 397, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.2.10.3 Exception — Olympic Sports. A National Collegiate Championship or a division championship in any Olympic sport shall be exempt from the minimum-sponsorship-percentage requirements of 18.2.3 and 18.2.4. The membership may adopt specific legislation to discontinue the championship in an Olympic sport."

Source: University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Santa Barbara; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; University of Oklahoma; Southern Connecticut State University; Springfield College; Syracuse University; U.S. Air Force Academy; U.S. Military Academy; U.S. Naval Academy; and College of William and Mary.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Having a protected status for NCAA championships in Olympic sports provides the opportunity to promote one of the purposes of the NCAA as stated in its Constitution: "To cooperate with other amateur athletics organizations in promoting and conducting national and international athletics events." Few international amateur events are as visible as the Olympic Games. Student-athletes who compete in the Olympics, World University Games and other international competitions reflect positively on individual member institutions and on the NCAA. It is a tribute to the intercollegiate athletics system in the United States that many Olympians have the opportunity to pursue an education at the same time they are training for international competition.

Committee Position (Executive Committee): The committee opposes this proposal, noting that the same proposal was opposed by the committee and defeated by the membership at the 1996 Convention.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 138 (NO. 2-138) CHAMPIONSHIPS — SIZE OF FIELDS/
AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION

Intent: In Division I, to strengthen championship access under a restructured NCAA governance system by mandating that the size of all NCAA championships fields be established by the Management Council.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 31.3.1, page 499, as follows:
[Division I only]

“31.3.1 Size of Championships Fields. The size of all NCAA championships fields shall be established by the Executive Committee, **in Divisions II and III and the Management Council in Division I** to provide for efficient management of the events, adequate NCAA championship opportunities relative to the nationwide quality of competition, and sound economic administration of the financial resources of the Association and of its championships.”

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 31.3.4, pages 500-503, as follows:
[Division I only]

“31.3.4 Automatic Qualification. **In Divisions II and III**, each governing sports committee may recommend annually to the Executive Committee those conferences that should receive automatic qualification for their teams or individual student-athletes into NCAA championships. The decision of the Executive Committee shall be final. Prior to recommending that a conference receive automatic qualification, a governing sports committee shall ensure that the member conference meets the requirements specified in sections 31.3.4.1 through 31.3.4.4. **In Division I, each governing sports committee shall forward annually to the Management Council those conferences that should receive automatic qualification for their teams or individual student-athletes into NCAA championships.** Prior to forwarding the list of conferences to receive automatic qualification, a governing sports committee shall ensure that the member conference meets the requirements specified in 31.3.4.1 through 31.3.4.5. A member conference may appeal to the Management Council the automatic-qualification review of the sports committee and the committee’s decision to find, or not find, a conference qualified for automatic-qualification status. The decision of the Management Council on such appeals will be final.

[31.3.4.1 through 31.3.4.5 unchanged.]

“31.3.4.6 Limitations on Automatic-Qualifying Positions. **In Divisions II and III**, the sports committees must limit the number of automatic-qualifying positions to be awarded in relationship to the size of the championships fields and the number of at-large positions that must remain open for other member institutions. **In Division I team sports, per**

31.3.4.5-(a), excluding the sport of football and any team sport in which automatic qualification is not offered, a sports committee must award, when a sufficient number of applications for automatic qualification exist, at least 50 percent of the championship field to conferences that meet automatic-qualification criteria, and provide a play-in criteria; the remaining 50 percent of the championship field shall be reserved for at-large teams. It will be the responsibility of the Management Council to determine if conference play-ins to a championship field are to be administered by the NCAA championships staff or by the member conferences.”

Source: NCAA Council, NCAA Executive Committee and all members of the Northeast, Metro Atlantic Athletic and Mid-Continent Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: At the 1996 NCAA Convention, the Division I membership instituted minimal Division I championship access guarantees pursuant to 4.01.2.3. This proposal strengthens those efforts by detailing further the process by which Division I championship participation is guaranteed and automatic conference selection is determined.

Committee Position (Executive Committee): The committee agreed to support this proposal if the sponsors amended it to apply only to Division I.

[Note: During its August meeting, the Council voted to cosponsor this proposal if the sponsors agreed to modify it to include the conditions specified by the Executive Committee. The sponsors have modified the proposal consistent with the Executive Committee’s recommendations.]

Action: Adopted in Division I.

NO. 139 (NO. 2-137) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — SPECIAL
EVENTS COMMITTEE

Intent: To clarify the role of the NCAA Special Events Committee under the restructured Division I governance system as specified.

- Bylaws:** Amend 30.10 by adding new 30.10.4, page 480, as follows:
[Division I only]

“30.10.4 Review Process. The Special Events Committee shall certify which events meet all the certification requirements set forth in 30.10, and shall report to the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors, after cabinet review, as follows:

“(a) Previously Exempted Events. The committee shall report through the Championships Cabinet which previously exempted events meet the certification re-

quirements and whether such events should continue to be exempted.

"(b) New or Revised Events. The committee shall recommend which new or revised events meet the certification requirements and, thus, may be considered for exempted status. Such recommendations shall be reported through the Championships and the Academics/Compliance/Eligibility Cabinets."

Source: NCAA Council and all members of the Southern Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In the new Division I governance structure, the certification process for existing exempted events or decertification of existing exempted events should involve the Special Events Committee making recommendations to the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors through the Championships Cabinet. For new or revised events seeking exempted status, the recommendations to the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors should move concurrently through the Championships and Academics/Compliance/Eligibility Cabinets before final review by the Board and Council.

Action: Moot in Division I.

NO. 139-1 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — SPECIAL EVENTS COMMITTEE

Intent: To further clarify the role of the NCAA Special Events Committee related to exempted events under the restructured Division I governance system.

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 139, 30.10.4, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.10.4 Review Process. The Special Events Committee shall certify which events meet all the certification requirements set forth in 30.10, and shall report to the Division I Management Council and Board of Directors, after cabinet review, as follows:

"(a) Previously Exempted Events. The committee shall report through the Championships Cabinet which previously exempted events meet the certification requirements and **shall recommend** whether such events should continue to be exempted."

[30.10.4-(b) unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Rationale: This amendment will clarify that in the new membership structure the Special Events Committee will recommend to the Championships Cabinet whether previously exempted events should continue to be exempted

Action: Moot in Division I.

NO. 140 RESOLUTION: DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIPS — AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION

[Division II only]

"Whereas, fairness dictates that all student-athletes should have equitable access to NCAA championship opportunities; and

"Whereas, such opportunities are best and most fairly determined in competition, but opportunities for interconference competition are being limited by scheduling practices and budget constraints; and

"Whereas, by eliminating automatic qualifiers the NCAA Division II Championships Committee is further replacing competition with the judgment of selection committees; and

"Whereas, restoring and expanding a program of automatic qualification will provide the least political method of selection; and

"Whereas, the new Division II governance structure gives an increased role in conferences and automatic reaffirms the importance of conference competition;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Division II Championships Committee and the Division II Project Team on Championships (1) consider developing championship structures in all team sports except football that would guarantee championship participation by every conference champion, subject only to standards to be set on minimum conference size and minimum number of conference contests (but not precluding the committee from making "at large" selections to complete the championship field), with no guarantee that all expenses for all rounds of the championship will be funded by the NCAA; and (2) submit legislation, if appropriate, to establish such structures for consideration by the membership at the January 1998 Convention."

Source: All members of the Great Lakes Valley Conference.

Action: Defeated in Division II.

NO. 141 RESOLUTION: FIRST DATE OF COMPETITION — DIVISION III CROSS COUNTRY, FIELD HOCKEY, SOCCER AND VOLLEYBALL

[Division III only]

"Whereas, Bylaw 17 currently allows an institution in Division III to engage in its first date of regular-season competition (excluding exhibition scrimmages) in the sports of cross country, field hockey, soccer and volleyball during the traditional season on September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday; and

"Whereas, the current provisions of Bylaw 17, allowing competition on the Friday preceding September 1 if September 1 falls on a Saturday or a Sunday, effectively allow institutions to conduct regular-season competition over the Labor Day weekend;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Division III Steering Committee be directed to consider whether it is appropriate to propose legislation, consistent with the intent of the current provisions of Bylaw 17, to permit an institution in Division III to engage in its first date of regular-season competition (excluding exhibition scrimmages) in the sports of cross country, field hockey, soccer and volleyball during the traditional season on September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday, inasmuch as such competition would be conducted over Labor Day weekend when September 1 falls on a Monday."

Source: All members of the University Athletic Conference.

Action: Adopted in Division III.

Deregulation

The NCAA Legislative Review Committee has identified the following proposals to facilitate the deregulation of the Association's playing and practice season legislation. The NCAA Council has approved the submission of these proposals to the membership as a "deregulation package." While these proposals are being submitted as a package, they each will be voted on separately in the appropriate business session.

NO. 142 (Dereg. 1) ELIGIBILITY — HARDSHIP WAIVER

Intent: To specify that the percentage calculation for purposes of meeting the hardship waiver in those sports that are subject to date-of-competition limitations shall be based on the institution's number of completed dates of competition (as opposed to varsity events).

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.5, pages 163-165, as follows:

[Federated provisions, all divisions, divided vote]

"14.2.5 Hardship Waiver. A student-athlete may be granted an additional year of competition by the conference or the Eligibility Committee for reasons of 'hardship.' Hardship is defined as an incapacity resulting from an injury or illness that has occurred under all of the following conditions:

[14.2.5-(a) and 14.2.5-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) The injury or illness occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than two *events* **contests or dates of competition (whichever is applicable to that sport)** or 20 percent (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed *events* **contests or dates of competition** in his or her sport for student-athletes in Divisions I and II and three *events* **contests or dates of competition (whichever is applicable to that sport)** or one-third (whichever number is greater) of the institution's completed

events **contests or dates of competition** in his or her sport for student-athletes in Division III. Only competition (excluding scrimmages and exhibition contests in Divisions I and II, but including such contests in Division III) against outside participants during the traditional playing season, or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), shall be countable under this limitation in calculating both the number of *events* **contests or dates of competition** in which the student-athlete has participated and the number of completed *events* **contests or dates of competition** during that season in the sport.

[14.2.5.1 and 14.2.5.2 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.3 Criteria for Administration of Hardship Waiver. The following criteria are to be employed in the administration of the hardship waiver:

[14.2.5.3.1 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.3.2 First-Half-of-Season Calculation. In determining if an injury or illness occurs in the first half of the traditional season in a sport with an odd number of contests **or dates of competition**, the injury or illness must have occurred prior to the beginning of the varsity contest **or date of competition** that starts the second half of the traditional season (e.g., an injury or illness occurring at any time after the beginning of the sixth game of an 11-game football schedule would be considered to be after the first half of the institution's season and would not qualify the student-athlete for a hardship waiver).

[14.2.5.3.3 and 14.2.5.3.4 unchanged.]

"14.2.5.3.4.1 Denominator in Percent Computation. The denominator in the institution's percent calculation shall be based on the institution's number of completed varsity *events* **contests or dates of competition** [see 14.2.5-(c)].

"14.2.5.3.4.2 Fraction in Percent Computation. Any computation of the percent limitation that results in a fractional portion of *an event* **a contest or date of competition** shall be rounded to the next whole number (e.g., 20 percent of a 27-game basketball schedule — 5.4 games — shall be considered six games).

"14.2.5.3.4.3 Conference Championships. A conference-championship *event* shall be counted as one contest **or date of competition** in determining the institution's completed *events* **contests or dates of competition** in that sport, regardless of the number of days or games involved in the championship. However, for purposes of this regulation, the calculation of completed *events* **contests or dates of competition** in a particular season

does not include postseason competition conducted subsequent to the completion of the institution's regular-season schedule and conference tournament.

"14.2.5.3.4.4 Tournament and Multiple-Team Events. For purposes of the hardship rule, tournaments and multiple team versus team *events* **competitions** are counted as follows:

- "(a) In individual sports (i.e., cross country, fencing, golf, gymnastics, rifle, skiing, swimming, tennis, track and field, wrestling), any competition involving participants from more than two institutions, conducted and organized as one *event* **competition** at one location on one calendar day (e.g., triple dual meet in wrestling, team invitational track meet), shall count as one *contest* **date of competition**, even though team scores against all participating institutions are kept separately, or the student-athletes participate against more than one opponent;
- "(b) In individual sports, each day of an individual's participation in a tournament or meet shall count as one *contest* **date of competition**; and
- "(c) In team sports **subject to contest limitations** (e.g., baseball, basketball, field hockey, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball, volleyball, water polo), an institution's participation against another institution in each contest in a tournament, doubleheader or multiple-team engagement shall count as one contest; and
- "(d) In team sports **subject to date-of-competition limitations** (e.g., lacrosse, volleyball, water polo), an institution's participation in a tournament, doubleheader or multiple-team engagement shall count as a date of competition for each day in which the institution participates."

[14.2.5.3.5 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: For those student-athletes who compete in sports that are subject to date-of-competition limitations, the percentage calculation for purposes of meeting the hardship waiver should be based on completed dates of competition (as opposed to varsity events).

Action: Adopted in Divisions I, II and III.

NO. 143 (Dereg. 2) **PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — COLLEGE-PROFESSIONAL CONTESTS**

A-226

Legislative Proposals

Intent: To delete the general principle set forth in 17.01.2 that precludes an institution from scheduling intercollegiate athletics contests in conjunction with professional sports contests or exhibitions (e.g., as a preliminary event).

Bylaws: Amend 17.01.2, page 253, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"17.01.2 *College-Professional Contests.* A member institution may compete against professional teams in any sport but otherwise shall not schedule intercollegiate athletics contests in conjunction with professional sports contests or exhibitions (e.g., as a preliminary event) (see 12.6.1.6)."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Current legislation permits institutions to compete against professional teams and also permits an institution to host a contest between two professional teams as a fund-raising activity. Allowing institutions to schedule intercollegiate contests in conjunction with professional sports contests will provide an avenue for some institutions to boost attendance and generate revenue in particular sports.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 144 (Dereg. 3) **PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CAMPS AND CLINICS**

Intent: To delete the general principle set forth in 17.01.3 that the Association's legislation may prescribe limits on the number of student-athletes in a particular sport who may be employed (e.g., as counselors or lecturers) or otherwise participate in camps and clinics.

Bylaws: Amend 17.01.3, page 253, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.01.3 *Camps and Clinics.* The Association's legislation may prescribe limits on the number of student-athletes in a particular sport who may be employed (e.g., as counselors or lecturers) or otherwise participate in camps and clinics, consistent with the Association's intent to limit out-of-season practice opportunities. (See 13.13 for additional regulations on camps and clinics)."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: In all sports other than football, it now is permissible for an institution to employ its student-athletes in its camps or clinics, inasmuch as the Association (for the most part) has agreed that such employment of student-athletes is not contrary to the prohibition against out-of-season practice. Thus, the general principle is no longer applicable.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I, II and III.

Legislative Proposals

A-227

NO. 145 (Dereg. 4) **PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS**
— DIVISIONS I AND II

Intent: In Divisions I and II, to simplify the legislation related to the length of playing seasons, the beginning of preseason practice, first date of competition and the end of the regular season by deleting all references to traditional and nontraditional playing seasons in Bylaw 17 and establishing a single date for the start of preseason practice, competition and the end of the regular season in each sport; further, to eliminate the weekly option and establish a single option using a specific number of days in determining the length of an institution's playing season [i.e., 132 days in Divisions I and II team sports (other than football and basketball); 144 days in Divisions I and II individual sports; 156 days for Divisions I and II institutions that sponsor both indoor and outdoor track and count both sports in meeting division membership requirements and 156 days in Divisions I and II women's rowing].

[This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Bylaw 17 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.2, pages 258-259, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.1.2 Segments of Playing Season. For all team sports and for all individual sports that do not utilize the 144-day traditional season option, each member institution may divide the playing season into not more than two distinct segments, as follows:

- "(a) *Traditional Segment.* The portion of the playing season that concludes with the NCAA championship in the sport shall be known as the 'traditional segment,' and
- "(b) *Nontraditional Segment.* The remaining portion of the playing season shall be known as the 'nontraditional segment.'"

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.8, pages 261-262, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.1.8 General Regulations for Computing Playing Seasons Applicable to All Sports

- "(a) *Summer.* For purposes of an institution's traditional segment, summer is defined as the period following the last date of final examinations for the spring term through August 15 or the first date on which classes are scheduled in the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first; for purposes of the nontraditional segment, summer is defined as the period following the last date of final examinations for the spring term through September 1 or the first date on which classes are scheduled in the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first;
- "(b) *Practice Only, Nontraditional Segment.* The nontraditional segment shall be counted as part of the institution's declared playing season, regardless of whether competition occurs during that segment."

[17.1.8-(c) through 17.1.8-(i) relettered as 17.1.8-(a) through 17.1.8-(g), unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.9, page 262, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.1.9 General Regulations for Computing Playing Seasons in Sports Utilizing Weekly Segment Options. In determining the length of an institution's playing season, the following regulations shall apply:

- "(a) *Consecutive Weeks.* In all sports in Division III and for all team sports and those individual sports that select the 24-week option in Divisions I and II, the playing season, or its segments, shall consist of consecutive seven-day periods;
- "(b) *Week.* Practice or competition during any part of a week shall be counted as a full week. A week shall be defined as any consecutive seven-day period, regardless of the day on which the seven-day period begins (e.g., nine full weeks and one day shall be counted as 10 weeks);
- "(c) *Total Combined Length.* The total number of weeks for both segments of a playing season combined shall not exceed the maximum permitted in a particular sport for a particular division and, except as otherwise noted, shall apply during the entire calendar year; and
- "(d) *Holiday, Vacation, Exam Periods.* In traditional and nontraditional segments, any practice or competition during published vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during the academic year shall be counted as part of the playing season. If practice or competition is not scheduled during any full week (seven consecutive days) that includes a vacation, final-examination period or holiday period, it neither shall be counted as part of the playing season nor shall constitute a break in a segment."

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.10, pages 262 and 268, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.1.10 Contest and Segment Limitations

"17.1.10.1 Combining Traditional and Nontraditional Segments. In those sports that have different contest limitations in the traditional **segment concluding with the NCAA championship** and nontraditional the other segments, a member institution that conducts a single continuous traditional segment in a sport (rather than dividing its playing season for that sport into two distinct segments as permitted in 17.1.2) shall be limited to the number of contests or dates of competition permitted only for the traditional segment of that **concludes with the NCAA championship** sport.

"17.1.10.2 Dividing Traditional and Nontraditional Segments — Divisions I and II. A member institution that divides its playing season into two distinct segments per 17.1.2 and conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall must complete all competition by January 1 of the academic year involved; conversely, a member institution that conducts its traditional segment in the fall may not participate in a contest during its nontraditional segment until after January 1 of the academic year involved. These restrictions do not preclude the completion of permissible practice activities in either segment after January 1.

[17.1.10.3 unchanged.]

"17.1.10.4 Conducting More Than 50 Percent of Schedule in Tennis During Nontraditional Segment — Divisions I and II. A member institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall and that schedules more than 50 percent of its

contests or dates of competition (including the conference championship) in the nontraditional segment may elect to utilize the preseason practice and first-date-of-competition regulations applicable to the traditional segments as set forth in 17.24.2 and 17.24.3."

[17.1.10.5 unchanged.]

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Bylaw 17 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

- E. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.4 through 17.27, pages 275-387, for each Division I and II team sport (other than football and basketball) by amending the respective sections entitled "Length of Playing Season, Preseason Practice, First Date of Competition and End of Regular Season," as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.____

"Regulations for computing the _____ playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figures 17-1, 17-2, 17-3.)

"17.____.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in _____ (traditional and nontraditional **both** segments combined) shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II — A *maximum of 22 weeks* **132-day season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.5.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition occurs.**

[17.____.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.____.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in _____ prior to the following dates:

"(a) **In sports in which the NCAA championship is not conducted during the fall term, the date that currently exists for the nontraditional segment in that sport, and**

"(b) **In sports in which the NCAA championship is conducted during the fall term, the date that currently exists for the traditional segment in that sport.**

[Note: Appropriate editorial changes will be made to delete all references to traditional and nontraditional in each sport and to insert a single applicable starting date in each sport.]

"17.____.3 First Contest Date. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in _____ prior to the following dates:

"(a) **In sports in which the NCAA championship is not conducted during the fall term, the date that currently exists for the nontraditional segment in that sport, and**

"(b) **In sports in which the NCAA championship is con-**

ducted during the fall term, the date that currently exists for the traditional segment in that sport.

[Note: Appropriate editorial changes will be made to delete all references to traditional and nontraditional in each sport and to insert a single applicable starting date in each sport.]

"17.____.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in each segment in the sport of _____ by the following dates:

"(a) **Traditional Segment — ~~the~~ the conclusion of the NCAA _____ championship in the institution's division, and or**

"(b) **Nontraditional Segment — ~~the~~ the last date of final exams for the regular academic year at the institution."**

- F. **Bylaws:** Amend 17.2 through 17.28, pages 268-392, for each Division I and II individual sport by amending the respective sections entitled "Length of Playing Season, Preseason Practice, First Date of Competition and End of Regular Season," as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.____

"Regulations for computing the _____ playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing Season Regulations. (Also see Figures 17-1, 17-2, 17-3.)

"17.____.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in _____ (traditional and nontraditional **both** segments combined) shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II. An institution *must select one of the following:* **shall be limited to**

"(1) *24-Week Option. A maximum of 24 weeks.*

"(2) *144-Day Traditional Season Option. A 144-day traditional season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only the time between these segments, required off days per 17.1.5.4 and official vacation, holiday and final examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur.*

"(3) *144-Day Traditional/Nontraditional Segment Option. A **a** 144-consecutive day season, which shall be divided into a traditional and nontraditional segment and which **may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.5.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur.***

[17.____.1-(b) unchanged.]

"17.____.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in *each segment* in _____ prior to the following dates:

"(a) **In sports in which the NCAA championship is not conducted during the fall term, the date that currently exists for the nontraditional segment in that sport, and**

"(b) In sports in which the NCAA championship is conducted during the fall term, the date that currently exists for the traditional segment in that sport.

[Note: Appropriate editorial changes will be made to delete all references to traditional and nontraditional in each sport and to insert a single applicable starting date in each sport.]

"[17.__.2.1-(b) and 17.__.2.2-(b) unchanged.]

"17.__.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in each segment in _____ prior to the following dates:

"(a) In sports in which the NCAA championship is not conducted during the fall term, the date that currently exists for the nontraditional segment in that sport, and

"(b) In sports in which the NCAA championship is conducted during the fall term, the date that currently exists for the traditional segment in that sport.

[Note: Appropriate editorial changes will be made to delete all references to traditional and nontraditional in each sport and to insert a single applicable starting date in each sport.]

[17.__.3.1-(b) and 17.__.3.2-(b) unchanged.]

"17.__.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition in each segment in the sport of _____ by the following dates:

"17.__.4.1 Traditional Segment. the conclusion of the NCAA _____ championship in the institution's division. **or**

"17.__.4.2 Nontraditional Segment. the last date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.

"17.__.4.3 144-Day Traditional Season. The conclusion of the NCAA _____ championships in the institution's division or the last date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The elimination of references to traditional and nontraditional segments, the establishment of specific dates for the beginning of practice, competition and the end of the season, and the elimination of alternatives for determining an institution's length of season will simplify the playing and practice season legislation in each sport. The proposed change also will reduce significantly the number of pages in the Manual in Bylaw 17 without substantively modifying the method by which institutions compute their playing seasons. Institutions will continue to be provided the opportunity to conduct two distinct consecutive-day segments in which a majority of their practice and competition opportunities occur in the segment in which the NCAA championship in that sport occurs. In sports in which the NCAA

championship does not occur during the fall term, the date for beginning preseason practice and competition would be consistent with the date that currently exists for the nontraditional segment. In sports in which the NCAA championship does occur during the fall term, the date for the start of practice and competition would be consistent with the date that currently exists for the traditional segment. For those limited number of institutions that may not emphasize participation in national championships and may wish to begin their season earlier than the prescribed dates, the Administrative Review Panel is the appropriate place to seek relief.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I and II.

NO. 146 (Dereg. 5) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISIONS I AND II EXTRA- ORDINARY PERSONNEL LOSSES

Intent: To delete the legislation that permits the NCAA Council to approve waivers to the length of the playing season for an institution that has suffered extraordinary personnel losses to its team due to an accident or illness of a disastrous nature.

[The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

Bylaws: Amend 17.3 through 17.27, pages 274-387, for each Division I and II sport by amending the section titled "Waivers for Extraordinary Personnel Losses", as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.__.9 Waivers for Extraordinary Personnel Losses. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers to the length of playing season (17.__.1) by modifying the start of preseason practice (17.__.2) for an institution that has suffered extraordinary personnel losses to its baseball team due to accident or illness of a disastrous nature."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The number of instances in which this bylaw has been used over the years is very few. Institutions may continue to use the Administrative Review Panel to seek relief of the application of the playing and practice season legislation, if and when such extraordinary personnel losses occur.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I and II.

NO. 147 (Dereg. 6) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE — BASKETBALL

Intent: To delete the exception to out-of-season basketball practice that permits members of an institution's basketball team to participate in a wheelchair basketball game against an established

wheelchair team following the close of the institution's regular basketball season.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.6, page 285, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.5.6 Out-of-Season Practice. Out-of-Season practice in basketball shall be prohibited. However, the following activities are not considered out-of-season practice:

[17.5.6-(a) through 17.5.6-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) *Wheelchair Game. Participation by members of an institution's basketball squad in a wheelchair basketball game against an established wheelchair team following the close of the institution's regular basketball season, provided the squad members do not wear regular basketball uniforms and there is no regular practice prior to the game; and*"

[Remainder of 17.5.6 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: The legislation that permits members of an institution's basketball team to participate in a wheelchair basketball game following the close of the regular season is rarely, if ever, invoked. In the spirit of deregulation, such an exception appears to no longer be necessary. An institution that wishes to conduct or participate in such a contest may request a waiver of the prohibition against out-of-season athletically related activities from the Administrative Review Panel.

Action: Adopted in Divisions I and II.

NO. 148 (Dereg. 7) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISION III — CONTEST/DATE OF COMPETITION EXEMPTIONS

Intent: To delete the legislation applicable in each Division III sport in which a Division III championship is conducted, which prohibits a Division III institution located outside of Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico from exempting from counting toward the maximum number of contests or dates of competition those contests or dates scheduled on a foreign tour taken in a sport in the same four-year period that the institution participated in contests or dates of competition in that sport on a single regular-season trip to Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico.

[The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.5.7, pages 278-390, for each Division III sport in which a Division III championship is conducted, by amending the respective section entitled "Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions — Division III," as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.5.7 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions — Division III

"(a) Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico — Division III. A maximum of four dates of competition on a regular-season trip to Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, or a tournament (not to exceed four dates of competition) in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, scheduled not more than once every four years by a Division III member institution located outside of Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, pursuant to the following:

"(1) This limitation shall not apply to a regular-season conference contest between two members of the same NCAA member conference, and.

"(2) A Division III member institution utilizing this exemption shall not participate in an institutionally certified foreign wrestling tour in the same four-year period (see 17.30 and 30.7)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.30.1, page 392, as follows:

[Division III only]

"17.30.1 Institutionally Certified Tours. A member institution may participate in competition in any sport on foreign tours certified by the institution in accordance with procedures set forth under 30.7, except the following:

"(a) *Division III. In the sports in which a Division III championship is conducted (i.e., baseball, basketball, cross country, field hockey, football, men's golf, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball, swimming, tennis, indoor/outdoor track, women's volleyball and wrestling), a Division III member institution located outside of Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico may not exempt from counting toward the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in a sport those contests or dates scheduled on a foreign tour taken in that sport in the same four-year period that the member institution participates in contests or dates of competition on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively. This restriction does not apply to Division III member institutions that take foreign tours in sports in which only one national championship is conducted.*"

[Remainder of 17.30.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: As a practical matter, most Division III institutions do not engage in a foreign tour and a trip to Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico in the same four-year period. However, such a prohibition is overly restrictive as it relates to opportunities for Division III student-athletes.

Action: Adopted in Division III.

NO. 149 (Dereg. 8) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — OUTSIDE COMPETITION — BASKETBALL

Intent: To delete the requirement that the NCAA Council must ap-

prove participation of sanctioned outside-team tours in the sport of basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 17.30.2, page 392, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17.30.2 Sanctioned Outside-Team Tours. An outside team that includes student-athletes from more than one member institution may participate in international competition in any sport on a foreign tour. However, any such outside team that includes more than the following number of student-athletes from the same member institution must be certified by the institution in accordance with procedures set forth in 30.7. *[Note: Approval by the NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, of such participation in basketball is required regardless of the number involved.]*"

[Remainder of 17.30.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1997.

Rationale: Currently, outside-team tours in the sport of basketball are the only tours that require approval by the Council. Such an approval process results in increased, unnecessary paperwork. Consistent with the spirit of deregulation, institutions should be permitted to handle the certification process per 30.7 if more than two of their basketball student-athletes participate on such a tour.

Action: Adopted in Division I and Division II.

**NO. 150 RESOLUTION: PARTICIPATION IN
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS —
DIVISION II ELIGIBILITY**

[Division II only]

"Whereas, there appears to be a general interest among the Division II membership in exploring ways to balance the opportunity for a competitive athletics experience for all individuals participating in Division II competition and to avoid a possible unfair advantage in this regard for more experienced athletes; and

"Whereas, the Division II Steering Committee and the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission recognize this interest and believe that all aspects of this topic deserve careful and deliberate study in order to assess the nature of the issue within Division II and, if appropriate, to identify possible alternatives that are consistent with the Division II philosophy:

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the governance groups within Division II work together to appoint a project team that would include chief executive officers, athletics administrators, faculty athletics representatives and student-athletes to review this issue and develop appropriate legislation for consideration by the Division

II membership at the 1998 Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Action: Adopted in Division II.

Appendix B

Roll-Call Voting

This is a summary of the roll-call votes that were conducted at the 1997 NCAA Convention in Nashville, Tennessee.

Each column represents a roll-call vote at the Convention. The number at the head of each column is the proposal number. Where letters are indicated, the reference is to parts of multipart proposals included in that vote. Proposals considered in more than one division business session are reported

Member	Div.	7 ADD FOH	7 CEI	7 J	8	8-1	9	12	3	14	15	16	17	18	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	27	
Ablene Christian University.....	II	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Adelphi University.....	II	No	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Adrian College.....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Agnes Scott College.....	III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
University of Akron.....	I-AA	No	—	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—
Alabama A&M University.....	II	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alabama State University.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
University of Alabama.....	I-AA	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Univ. of Alabama-Birmingham.....	I-AA	—	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Univ. of Alabama-Huntsville.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Univ. of Alaska-Anchorage.....	II	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Univ. of Alaska-Fairbanks.....	II	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Albany State College (GA).....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
State University of N.Y. at Albany.....	II	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Albertus Magnus College.....	III	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Albion College.....	III	—	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Albright College.....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alcorn State University.....	I-AA	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alderson-Broaddus College.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alfred University.....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Allegheny College.....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Allentown College.....	III	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alma College.....	III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alvernia College.....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
America East Conference.....	I-AAA	No	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
American International College.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
American University.....	I-AAA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Amherst College.....	III	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Anderson University.....	II	No	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Angelo State University.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Anna Maria College.....	III	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—
Appalachian State University.....	I-AA	—	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arizona State University.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
University of Arizona.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arkansas State University.....	I-AA	No	—	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Univ. of Arkansas-Fayetteville.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Univ. of Arkansas-Little Rock.....	I-AAA	—	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Armstrong Atlantic State College.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Ashland University.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Assumption College.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Atlantic 10 Conference.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Atlantic Coast Conference.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abs	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Auburn University.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Augusta State University.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Augustana College (IL).....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Augustana College (SD).....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Aurora University.....	III	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Austin Peay State University.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Averett College.....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Babson College.....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Baldwin-Wallace College.....	III	No	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ball State University.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bard College.....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Barry University.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Barton College.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bates College.....	II	No	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Baylor University.....	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—
Beaver College.....	II	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bellarmino College.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Bemidji State University.....	II	Yes	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Benedictine University.....	III	No	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bennett College.....	III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bentley College.....	II	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—
Bernard M. Baruch College.....	III	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bethany College (W.V.).....	III	No	No	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

in separate columns labeled by division.

The votes published on pages 238 through 259 include Proposals Nos. 7 through 48 (except for proposals that were withdrawn or not moved for consideration). A summary of the other roll-call votes — Proposal Nos. 49 through 78 — are published on pages 260 through 281.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Member	Div.	7 ABD FGH	7 CEI	7 J	8	8-1	9	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	26	27	27
Saint Thomas, University of (MN)	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stanford University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State University of N.Y. Athletic Conf.	III	Yes	Yes	Yes																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
College of Staten Island	III	Abs	Abs	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stephen F. Austin State University	I-AA	No	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stetson University	I-AAA	No	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes																
State Univ. of N.Y. at Stony Brook	III	No	Yes	No																				
Suffolk University	III	No	Yes	No																				
Sun Belt Conference	I-AAA	No	Yes																		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sunshine State Conference	III	No	No																					
Susquehanna University	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Swarthmore College	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweet Briar College	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Syracuse University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Tampa	II	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tarleton State University	II	No	No	No																				
Temple University	I-A	No	No	No																				
Tennessee State University	I-AA	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Tennessee Technological Univ.	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes								
University of Tennessee-Chattanooga	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
University of Tennessee-Knoxville	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
University of Tennessee-Martin	I-AA	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes								
University of Texas-Arlington	I-AAA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes								
University of Texas-Austin	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes								
University of Texas-El Paso	I-A	No	Yes	Yes																				
University of Texas-San Antonio	I-AAA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Texas A&M University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Texas A&M-Commerce	II	No	Yes	No																				
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	II	No	Yes	No																				
Texas Christian University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Abs	Abs	Abs	Abs	Yes	Abs	No	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Univ. of Texas-Pan American	I-AAA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Texas Southern University	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Texas Tech University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Texas Woman's University	III	No	No	No																				
Thiel College	III	No	No	No																				
University of Toledo	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Towson State University	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Trans America Athletic Conference	I-AAA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Trinity College (CT)	III	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Trinity University (TX)	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Troy State University	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Truman State University	III	No	No	No																				
Tufts University	III	Yes																						
Tulane University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Tulsa	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Tuskegee University	II	No	Yes	No																				
U.S. Air Force Academy	I-A	No	No	No	Abs	Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	III	No	Abs																		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	III	No	Abs																		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
U.S. Military Academy	I-A	No	No				Yes	Yes													Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
U.S. Naval Academy	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Union College (NY)	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
University Athletic Association	III	Abs	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Upper Iowa University	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Upstate Collegiate Athl. Conference	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ursinus College	III	Yes																						
Utah State University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abs	No	Yes	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Utah	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Utica College	III	No	No	No																				
Valdosta State University	II	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Valparaiso University	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Vanderbilt University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Vassar College	III	No	No	No																				
University of Vermont	I-AAA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Villanova University	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Virginia Commonwealth University	I-AAA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Virginia Military Institute	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Virginia State University	II	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								
Virginia Union University	II	No	Yes	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Virginia Wesleyan College	III	No	Yes	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Virginia	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Wabash College	III	No	No	No																				
Wagner College	I-AA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wake Forest University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Wartburg College	III	No	Abs	Abs																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washburn University	II	No	No	No																				
Washington & Jefferson College	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washington & Lee University	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washington College (MD)	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washington State University	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Washington University (MO)	III	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
University of Washington	I-A	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes								
Wayne State University (MI)	II	No	No	No																				
Wayne State College (NE)	II	No	No	No																	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

28-1	28-2	28 AC	28 B	28 N	28 O	28 P	28 P	32	33	34	35	35-1	35-2	36	38 AC	38 BDE	40	41	42	44	46	47-1 A	47-1 B	47-2	47 A	48
D-M																										
No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Abs	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No	Yes
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abs	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	No	No	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Abs	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Abs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	No	Yes	—	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	No	No	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	No	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—															

Proposals Nos. 49-78 Roll-Call Votes

Institution	Div.	49	50	51	52	53	54	54	55	55	55	55	56	57	57	58	58-1	59	59	59
									I	II	III	III		A	B			A-D	A-D	BC
Abilene Christian University	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	No	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Adelphi University	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Adrian College	III	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Agnes Scott College	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
University of Akron	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Alabama A&M University	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---
Alabama State University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
University of Alabama	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Univ. of Alabama-Birmingham	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	---
Univ. of Alabama-Huntsville	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	---
Univ. of Alaska-Anchorage	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Univ. of Alaska-Fairbanks	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Albany State College (GA.)	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
State Univ. of NY at Albany	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Albertus Magnus College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Albion College	III	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Albright College	III	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Alcorn State University	I-AA	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	No	Yes	---	Yes	Yes	---
Alderson-Brooks College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Alfred University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Allegheny College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Allentown College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Alma College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Alvernia College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
American East Conference	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Abs	Abs	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
American International College	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
American University	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Amherst College	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Anderson University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Angelo State University	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Anna Maria College	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Appalachian State University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Arizona State University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
University of Arizona	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Arkansas State University	I-A	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Univ. of Arkansas-Fayetteville	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Univ. of Arkansas-Little Rock	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Armstrong Atlantic State College	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Ashland University	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Assumption College	II	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Atlantic 10 Conference	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Atlantic Coast Conference	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Auburn University	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Augusta State University	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Augustana College (IL)	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Augustana College (SD)	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Aurora University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Austin Peay State University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Averett College	III	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Babson College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Baldwin-Wallace College	III	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Ball State University	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Bard College	III	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Barry University	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Barton College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bates College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Baylor University	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	No	No	---
Beaver College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bellarmine College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bemidji State University	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Benedictine University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bennett College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bentley College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bernard M. Baruch College	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bethany College (WV)	III	---	Yes	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bethel College (MN)	III	---	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bethune-Cookman College	I-AA	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Big 12 Conference	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Big East Conference	I-A	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Big Sky Conference	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Big South Conference	I-AAA	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Big Ten Conference	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Big West Conference	I-A	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
State Univ. of NY at Binghamton	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Blackburn College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Bloomsburg University	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Bluefield State College	II	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Boise State University	I-A	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Boston College	I-A	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---
Boston University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---

[illegible]

A-263

Institution	Div.	49	50	51	52	53	54	54	55	55	55	55	56	57	57	58	58-1	59	59	59
									I	II	III	III		A	B			A-D	A-D	BC
														MTR				Enl.		
Cleveland State University	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Coastal Carolina University	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Coe College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	No	---	Yes	Yes	---	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Coker College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Cotby-Sawyer College	III	---	---	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Colgate University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	No	---	No	Yes	Yes	---	Yes	Yes	---
College Conf. Illinois & Wisconsin	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
College Misericordia	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Colonial Athletic Association	I-AAA	Yes	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Colorado Christian University	II	---	Yes	Yes	---	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Colorado College	III	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Colorado School of Mines	I-A	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes
Colorado State University	I-AA	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Univ. of Colorado, Colorado Springs	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
University of Colorado	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Columbia Univ.-Barnard College	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Columbus State University	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Commonwealth Coast Conference	III	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Concord College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Concordia College (MN)	III	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Concordia College (NY)	III	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Concordia University	III	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Concordia University (NY)	I-AA	---	---	---	---	---	Abs	Abs	---	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Conference USA	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Connecticut College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	---	Yes	---
University of Connecticut	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	Yes	Yes	---
Constitution Athletic Conference	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Coppin State College	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Cornell College (IA)	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Cornell University (NY)	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
State Univ. College at Cortland	III	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Craigton University	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Curry College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	No	No	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Daniel Webster College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Dartmouth College	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Davidson College	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Davis and Elkins College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
University of Dayton	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
DePaul University	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
DePaul University	II	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	---
Delaware State University	I-AA	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Delaware Valley College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
University of Delaware	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes
Delta State University	III	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Denison University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
University of Denver	II	---	Yes	Abs	Abs	Abs	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
University of Detroit Mercy	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Abs	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Dickinson College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	---
Dixie Intercol. Athletic Conference	III	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Dowling College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Drake University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	No	---	---	---	No	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Drew University	III	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Drexel University	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Drury College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
University of Dubuque	III	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Duke University	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes
Duquesne University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Earlham College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes
East Carolina University	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
East Stroudsburg University	II	---	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
East Tennessee State Univ.	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Eastern College Athletic Conference	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Eastern Conn. State University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	No	No	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Eastern Illinois University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes
Eastern Kentucky University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Eastern Mennonite University	III	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Eastern Michigan University	I-A	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Eastern New Mexico University	II	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	---
Eastern Washington University	I-AA	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Eckerd College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Edinboro University	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Elizabeth City State Univ.	II	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Elizabethtown College	III	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Elmhurst College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	No	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Elon College	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Emerson-Mass College of Art	III	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Emory & Henry College	III	---	---	---	---	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emory University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Emporia State University	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
Endicott College	III	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Erskine	II	---	---	---	---	Abs	Abs	---	---	---	Abs	Abs	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---
University of Evansville	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Fairfield University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---
Fairleigh Dickinson U.-Madison	III	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Fairleigh Dickinson U.-Teaneck	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Fairmont State College	II	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

60 I-A VTR	60 I-A Rec.	60 FB	60 BKB	62 MTR	62	62-1	62 B (b)	65	66	67	68	72 A	72 A	72 B	72 B	74	75	75	77 MTR	77 MTR	78	78
---	---	---	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	---	No	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	No	No	No	No	No	No
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	No	Yes	---	Yes	Yes	No	---	No	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	No	No	Yes	No	No	---	No	No	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---</	

[illegible]

A-268A-269

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Institution	Div.	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80
West Virginia Univ. Institute	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes																											
West Virginia University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
West Virginia Wesleyan College	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western Athletic Conference	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western Carolina University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western Conn. State University	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western Illinois University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western Kentucky University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western Maryland College	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western Michigan University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western New Mexico University	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Western State College	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Westfield State College	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Westminster College	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wheaton College (IL)	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wheaton College (MA)	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wheeling Jesuit University	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Whittier College	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wichita State University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Widener University	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wilkes College	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
College of William & Mary	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
William Paterson College	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
William Penn College	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Williams College	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wilmington College (OH)	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wingate College	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Winona State University	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Winston-Salem State Univ.	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Winthrop University	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wisc State University Conf.	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wisc Women's Intercol Ath Conf.	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Eau Claire	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Green Bay	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-La Crosse	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Parkside	II		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Platteville	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-River Falls	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
U. of Wisconsin-Stevens Point	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Stout	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Univ. of Wisconsin-Whitewater	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wittenberg University	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wofford College	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
College of Wooster	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Worcester Polytechnic Inst.	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Worcester State College	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Wright State University	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
University of Wyoming	I-AA	No	No	No	No	No		No																									
Xavier University (OH)	I-AAA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Yale University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Yeshiva University	III		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									
Youngstown State University	I-AA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																									

	60 I-A VTR	60 I-A Rec.	60 FB	60 BKB	62 MTR	62	62-1	62 B (b)	65	66	67	68	72 A	72 A	72 B	72 B	74	75	75	77 MTR	77 MTR	78	78
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abs	Yes	Abs	No	No	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---
Yes	No	Yes	No	---	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	---	---	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
---	---	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	---	---	No	Yes	No	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Abs	Abs	Yes	Yes
No	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	No	No	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	No	No	No	No	No	No
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	---	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	Yes	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---						

Appendix C

91st Annual Convention Committees

Voting Committee

- Chair—Larry R. Gerlach
 District 1—Debi F. McGrath, Colby-Sayer College (Division III)
 District 2—Col. Albert Vanderbush, U.S. Military Academy
 (Division I-A)
 District 3—To be appointed (Division I-A)
 District 4—To be appointed (Division II)
 District 5—Jean A. Berger, Drake University (Division I-AA)
 District 6—Barbara J. Jacket, Prairie View A&M University
 (Division I-AA)
 District 7—Jack L. Bishop, Southern Utah University
 (Division I-AA)
 District 8—Albert T. Gonzales, New Mexico State University
 (Division I-A)
 At Large—Larry R. Gerlach, University of Utah (Division I-A)
 At Large—Donald Harnum, Susquehanna University
 (Division III)
 At Large—Betsy J. Mosher, Northwestern University
 (Division I-A)
 At Large—Hallie E. Gregory, University of Maryland,
 Eastern Shore (Division I-AAA)
 At Large—Alan J. White, Elon College (Division II)

Credentials Committee

- Chair—Joseph A. Etzel
 Susan R. Larkin, John Jay College of Criminal Justice
 (Division III)
 Joseph A. Etzel, University of Portland (Division I)
 Mark Fohl, University of Minnesota, Morris (Division II)

Parliamentarian

- Paul Engelmann, Central Missouri State University

Appendix D

Past Convention Sites

Convention	Year	City, Hotel
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929*	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
35th	1940	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadillac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944†	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)

*Convened January 1, 1930.

†Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committee only.

46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fountainbleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fountainbleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)
6th Special	1987	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
82nd	1988	Nashville (Opryland)
83rd	1989	San Francisco (Hilton)
84th	1990	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
85th	1991	Nashville (Opryland)
86th	1992	Anaheim (Hilton and Towers)
87th	1993	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
88th	1994	San Antonio (Marriott Rivercenter)
89th	1995	San Diego (San Diego Convention Center)
90th	1996	Dallas (Loews Anatole)

Past Convention Sites

A-284

Appendix E

NCAA Officers, 1906-1997

Years Name, Institution

President

1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University,
 University of Wyoming
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts University
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas at Austin
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1989-1990—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1991-1992—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1993-1995—Joseph N. Crowley, University of Nevada
 1996-1997—Eugene F. Corrigan, Atlantic Coast Conference

Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 1908—William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
 (Treasurer only)
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
 1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
 1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University

A-285 1997 Convention Proceedings

1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
 1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
 1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
 1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University,
 University of District of Columbia

1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
 1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
 1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingham College
 1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton
 1989-1990—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1991-1992—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
 1993—Cedric W. Dempsey, University of Arizona
 1994-1995—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
 1985—Arless L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
 1986—Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
 1987-1988—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1989-1990—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
 1991—Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California, Los Angeles
 1992-1993—R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton
 1994-1995—William M. Sangster, Georgia Institute of Technology
 1996-1997—Robert M. Sweazy, Texas Tech University

Division II Vice-President

1983—Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska Fairbanks
 1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
 1986—Asa N. Green, Livingston University
 1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
 1989-1990—Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University
 1991-1992—Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University
 of Pennsylvania
 1993-1995—Charles N. Lindemann, Humboldt State University
 1996-1997—Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University

Division III Vice-President

1983—Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
 1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
 1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1988-1989—Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster
 1990-1991—Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University
 1992-1993—John H. Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University
 1994-1995—Edward G. Coll Jr., Alfred University
 1996-1997—Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse